| | | <u> </u> | | | 3 |
|----------------------------|--|----------------|----|---|---------------------------------------|
| | 1 | 1 | | WITNESS IN | DEX |
| 1 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO | 2 | | EXAMINATION | PAGE |
| 2 | EASTERN DIVISION | 3 | | CROSS-EXAMINATION | |
| 3 | ERNEST G. COOK, Plaintiff, | | | BY MS. GROEDEL | 4 |
| 5 | JUDGE BENITA PEARSON | 4 | | | |
| 6 | -vs- CASE NO. 4:22-CV-00077-BYP VOLUME I | 5 | | EXHIBIT IND | EX |
| 7 | BOARD OF TRUMBULL COUNTY COMMISSIONERS, | | | | |
| 8 | Defendant. | 6 | | EXHIBIT NUMBER | PAGE |
| 9 | | 7 | | Plaintiff's Exhibit 2 | 21 |
| 10 | Video conference Zoom Deposition of MICHELE | | | Plaintiff's Exhibit 3 | 47 |
| 11 | NICOLE FRENCHKO, taken as if upon cross-examination before Kelli Rae Page, a Notary Public within and | 8 | | Plaintiff's Exhibits 4 and 5 | 55 |
| 13 | for the State of Ohio, at 2:21 p.m. on Monday, May | 9 | | | |
| 14 | 1, 2023, pursuant to notice and/or stipulations of | 40 | | | |
| 15 | counsel, on behalf of the Plaintiff in this cause. | 10 11 | | | |
| 16 | | 12 | | | |
| 17 | | 13 14 | | | |
| 18 | PAGE REPORTING SERVICE 1249 HATHAWAY AVENUE, FLOOR 2 LAKEWOOD, OH 44107 | 15 | | | |
| 20 | 216.316.3258 kellipage@pagereportingservice.comB | 16 | | | |
| 21 | | 17 18 | | | |
| 22 | | 19 | | | |
| 23 | | 20 | | | |
| 24 | | 21 22 | | | |
| 25 | | 23 | | | |
| | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | 24 | | | |
| | | 25 | | MICHELE NICOLE | FRENCHKO |
| 1 | 2 APPEARANCES: | | | | 4 |
| 2 | (All participants were in attendance via remote | 1 | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCI | HKO, of lawful age, |
| | connection through individual Zoom video | 2 | | called by the Plaintiff for the p | urpose of |
| 3 | conferencing as follows:) | 3 | | cross-examination, as provided | • |
| 4 | Caryn M. Groedel, Esq. Caryn Groedel & Associates Co., LPA | 4 | | Civil Procedure, being by me fi | , , |
| 5 | 208 Spriggel Drive | 5 | | hereinafter certified, deposed a | |
| 6 | Munroe Falls, Ohio 44262 1291 SW Mulberry Way | 7 | | CROSS-EXAMINATION OF MI BY MS. GROEDEL: | CHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO |
| 7 | Boca Raton, Florida 33486 440.230.3803 | 8 | 0 | Could you, please, state your f | iull name for the |
| | cgroedel@groedel-law.com | 9 | Œ. | record? | un name for the |
| 8 | On behalf of the Plaintiff; | 10 | Δ | Michele Nicole Frenchko. | |
| 9 | Kathleen M. Minahan, Esq. | 11 | _ | Before we begin, three quick re | ıles. I'm sure vou |
| 10 | Meyers, Roman, Friedberg & Lewis | 12 | | remember. Please give verbal | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| 11 | 28601 Chagrin Boulevard, Suite 600 Cleveland, Ohio 44122 | 13 | | nodding or shaking your head | or saying "uh-huh" or |
| 12 | 216.831.0042 x223 kminahan@meyersroman.com | 14 | | "uh-uh." Please let me finish a | sking my question |
| 13 | On behalf of the Defendant. | 15 | | before you start answering it, | and also if you |
| | on behalf of the belefidant. | 16 | | haven't heard the question or | don't understand it, |
| 14 | | 17 | | please let me know and I will r | ephrase it or say it |
| 15 | ALSO PRESENT: | 18 | | louder so that you do understa | nd it and you do hear |
| 16 | | 19 | | it. Okay? | |
| 17 | Ernest Cook Mauro Cantalamessa | 20 | | Okay. | |
| | | 21 | Q. | Are you taking any medication | s that would affect or |
| 18 19 | | | | | |
| 19 20 | | 22 | | impair your ability to understa | |
| 19 | | 22 23 | _ | use your full recall? | |
| 19 20 21 22 23 | | 22 23 24 | | use your full recall? | nd my questions or |
| 19 20 21 22 | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | 22 23 | | use your full recall? | nd my questions or |

| | | | 5 | | | 7 |
|-------|----|----|--|-------|------|--|
| 02:23 | 1 | | MS. GROEDEL: Kathleen, did you send | 02:30 | 1 | took notes. |
| | 2 | | it to her? | | 2 | But journal actions, employee information, |
| | 3 | | MS. MINAHAN: I can't find it, Caryn. | | 3 | files, some of the previous legal paperwork |
| | 4 | | I have looked. I know you sent it on 4/24, but | | 4 | associated with this case and the complaints and |
| | 5 | | I can't find it. | | 5 | responses, policies. That's all I can recall right |
| | 6 | | MS. GROEDEL: Okay. I'll get it. | | 6 | now, but, again, it's nonexhaustive. |
| | 7 | Q. | What is your e-mail, Ms. Frenchko? | | | Okay. You said you discussed with employees and HR |
| | 8 | Α. | | | 8 | certain things. Which employees? |
| | 9 | | I am, so I can send you the exhibit. | | 9 A. | • , , |
| | 10 | | I have a question. | 1 | 0 | DeVengencie-Bush. |
| | 11 | | Okay. | | 1 Q. | _ |
| | 12 | A. | | 1 | 2 | how many times has a matter of a disciplinary |
| | 13 | Q. | No. | | 3 | action come before the commissioners that involves |
| | 14 | | Okay. | | 4 | a monetary what did she say, a monetary |
| | 15 | Q. | Let me know when you have received it and have | 1 | 5 A. | |
| | 16 | | reviewed it. | | | Impact, right of employees who report directly |
| | 17 | A. | Yes. Do you want me to read it word for word? | 1 | 7 | to you? |
| | 18 | Q. | No. | | | Am I to be answering things that Alex was prepared |
| | 19 | A. | Okay. I have received it and I have reviewed it. | 1 | 9 | to, because I could glance at what you requested, |
| | 20 | Q. | Okay. Have you seen it before today? | 2 | :0 | if my attorney thinks that that's acceptable. Is |
| | 21 | A. | No. | 2 | :1 | there something else that I'm responding to |
| 1 2 | 22 | Q. | Which of these categories of questions, and there | 2 | 2 Q. | |
| 1 | 23 | | are 15 of them, are you prepared to testify about? | 2 | 3 | it because she's too new in that position. |
| 1 | 24 | A. | I have 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, and 15. | 2 | 4 | MS. MINAHAN: Okay. I'm going to |
| 1 | 25 | | Wait. Are there more? Yes, that's it. | 2 | :5 | object that this was all known ahead of time. |
| | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO |
| | | | 6 | | | 8 |
| 02:27 | 1 | Q. | Okay. | 02:32 | 1 | I told you this ahead of time, but if |
| | 2 | A. | Wait, 1. I'm sorry. Also, I had a first set and | | 2 | Commissioner Frenchko believes that she has the |
| | 3 | | here is the second one. Also 1. Also 1. | | 3 | foundation to go ahead and answer for at least |
| | 4 | Q. | So 1, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13 and 15; is that | | 4 | a part of the |
| | 5 | | correct? | | 5 | MS. GROEDEL: Your objection you |
| | 6 | A. | I believe that's correct. | | 6 | cannot do any speaking objections. It is |
| | 7 | Q. | Okay. And what did you do to prepare for this | | 7 | utterly inappropriate. If you have an |
| | 8 | | deposition? | | 8 | objection, place it on the record. |
| | 9 | A. | I'm sorry. I lost the Zoom on my screen. I | | 9 | MS. MINAHAN: I'm not making an |
| · | 10 | | apologize. Wait. Here it is. Okay. | 1 | 0 | objection, ma'am. Please listen to me. |
| · | 11 | | What did I do to prepare? I reviewed all of | 1 | 1 | MS. GROEDEL: Well, we're not doing |
| · | 12 | | the I reviewed everything that was contained | 1 | 2 | this, if she remembers, and if she feels, and |
| ′ | 13 | | all of the topics that were related, the defenses, | 1 | 3 | if she does this. No, that's not how it goes, |
| · | 14 | | the responses. I reviewed internal internal | 1 | 4 | Kathleen. Please, just don't interfere with |
| | 15 | | documents. I reviewed files and discussed with | | 5 | the deposition. |
| · | 16 | | some employees in HR the specific answers. I did | 1 | 6 | MS. MINAHAN: Okay. Then the witness |
| · · | 17 | | internal research, and I spoke to counsel. | 1 | 7 | is instructed not to answer anything that's not |
| 1 | 18 | Q. | What internal documents did you review? | | 8 | her assigned topic. |
| | 19 | A. | I apologize. I was more prepared to go forward a | | 9 | MS. GROEDEL: Okay. I'm going to ask |
| | 20 | | week ago, so I don't have if I'm missing | | :0 | you, before I, as a last good faith |
| | 21 | | something I just want to assure that it's known | | :1 | meet-and-confer, to withdraw your objection. |
| | 22 | | that it's a nonexhaustive list in case there is | | 2 | You have no right to instruct her not to |
| | 23 | | something that I'm missing. | | 3 | answer. |
| | 24 | | I reviewed journal actions. I don't have | | 4 | MS. MINAHAN: I tried to explain to |
| 2 | 25 | | anything with me right now that I did review. I | 2 | :5 | you the basis for this. You wouldn't let me |
| | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO |

| | | | 9 | | | | 11 |
|---------|------|----|---|---------|----|----|--|
| 02:33 | 1 | | speak, so what I told her is if you won't let | 02:37 | 1 | | specifically, and it was kind of broken. |
| | 2 | | me speak, my answer is the witness is | | 2 | Q. | The question is only for employees for whom the |
| | 3 | | instructed not to answer. | | 3 | | commission is the appointing authority; okay? |
| | 4 | | MS. GROEDEL: Okay. You're right. I | | 4 | A. | Uh-huh. |
| | 5 | | don't want a speaking objection. I think it's | | 5 | Q. | So with respect to that group of employees only, |
| | 6 | | inappropriate. So I will take this one up with | | 6 | | what discipline which employees had been subject |
| | 7 | | the Judge. | | 7 | | to discipline by the commissioners subject to |
| | 8 | | MS. MINAHAN: Do whatever you want. | | 8 | | discipline? |
| | 9 | | MS. GROEDEL: In the meantime, that's | | 9 | A. | I don't recall all I don't one, I don't know |
| | 10 | | the category and how that's been handled. | | 10 | | all of them because a lot of those things are |
| | 11 | A. | I apologize. I was reading Number 2, and, kind of, | | 11 | | handled by department heads. And, two, I just |
| | 12 | | not paying attention to you, ma'am. | | 12 | | don't remember every situation. |
| | 13 | | Did you just address me, I'm sorry? I was | | 13 | Q. | I didn't ask for every which ones do you recall, |
| | 14 | | reading that Number 2. | | 14 | | ma'am? |
| | 15 | | MS. MINAHAN: Commissioner, Caryn will | | 15 | A. | Are you talking about employees who are union or |
| | 16 | | not let me explain, so don't answer the topic. | | 16 | | non fiduciary, like department heads that are |
| | 17 | | MS. GROEDEL: No, you can explain, you | | 17 | | more similar to Mr. Cook, or the classified union |
| | 18 | | just can't keep doing speaking objections, | | 18 | | employees? |
| | 19 | | Kathleen. You're not going to tell her how to | | 19 | Q. | Not union? |
| | 20 | | answer so that she can say, "I don't know." | | 20 | A. | Not the union classified ones? |
| | 21 | A. | No, ma'am | | 21 | Q. | Right. |
| | 22 | | MS. MINAHAN: That's not what I was | | 22 | A. | Nonunion? To the best of my recollection, the only |
| | 23 | | doing, but you won't listen to me, so | | 23 | | nonunion one that we had an issue concerning |
| | 24 | | MS. GROEDEL: Go ahead. Go ahead. If | | 24 | | discipline was the HR director, Richard Jackson. |
| | 25 | | this is going to avoid a dispute going before | | 25 | Q. | There was also Mr. Cook? |
| | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO |
| | | | 10 | | | | 12 |
| 02:35 | 1 | | the Judge, go ahead and explain. | 02:39 | 1 | A. | I'm sorry, I apologize. Of course, Mr. Cook. And |
| | 2 | | MS. MINAHAN: What I was saying is | | 2 | | then the dog one, that's a union employee. He's a |
| | 3 | | that if Commissioner Frenchko believes that she | | 3 | | lower level employee. |
| | 4 | | can testify about topic 2 as for the time | | 4 | Q. | Okay. Is there what was the Richard |
| | 5 | | period when she was a commissioner, then she is | | 5 | | Jackson's alleged offense or offenses? |
| | 6 | | welcome to do so. | | 6 | A. | I don't remember specifically what it was called, |
| | 7 | Q. | Okay. During the time you have been a | | 7 | | like categorically. |
| | 8 | | commissioner, Ms. Frenchko | | 8 | Q. | Well, even if you don't know the name of it, what |
| | 9 | A. | I'm sorry. I have to go the wind just caught my | | 9 | | was he accused of doing? |
| | 10 | | door and my door floated open. I'm sorry. | | 10 | A. | He told me not to get all hot and bothered, which |
| | 11 | | The question was just for during the time | | 11 | | is inappropriate, insubordination. I honestly |
| | 12 | | period that I was there, which would be from the | | 12 | | can't remember. It was just conduct that was |
| | 13 | | beginning of January until current; right? | | 13 | | completely unacceptable for an employee to talk to |
| | 14 | Q. | Right. | | 14 | | their appointing authority in that fashion. |
| | 15 | A. | Okay. So what was the question? | | 15 | Q. | Okay. And then there was a vote on the discipline |
| | 16 | Q. | Let's just get it on the record. You started in | | 16 | | to be imposed? |
| | 17 | | your role as commissioner on what date? | | 17 | A. | Yes. |
| | 18 | A. | Approximately January 3rd of 2021. | | 18 | Q. | And what was the discipline that was decided upon? |
| | 19 | Q. | And since January of 2021 with respect to employees | | 19 | A. | I believe it was suspension unpaid. |
| | 20 | | for whom the commissioners are the appointing | | 20 | Q. | And then he retired or resigned during that, or |
| | 21 | | authority, what disciplinary matters have the | | 21 | | when he returned? |
|] : | 22 | | commissioners considered or discussed or yeah, | : | 22 | A. | What is your question specifically? |
|] : | 23 | | considered discipline for employees for whom the | : | 23 | Q. | And then did he serve the suspension? |
| | 24 | | commissioners are the appointing authority? | : | 24 | A. | Yes. |
| | 25 | A. | Can you, please, repeat that? I want to answer it | : | 25 | Q. | And did he return or resign or retire after the |
| | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO |
| 3 of 36 | shee | tc | Page 9 to | 12 of 9 | 3 | | 05/12/2023 10:46:32 AM |

| | | | 13 | | | 15 |
|-------|--|----------------------|--|--|----------------------------|---|
| 02:41 | 1 | | suspension or during the suspension? | 02:45 1 | | employee. Those are the only ones that I can |
| | 2 | A. | After. | 2 | | remember right now. |
| | 3 | Q. | So he had returned to work already? | 3 | Q. | What were the infractions alleged to have been |
| | 4 | A. | Yes. | 4 | | committed by the one or two 911 employees? |
| | 5 | Q. | Okay. You said a lot of the discipline is handled | 5 | Α. | I can't recall specifically. |
| | 6 | | by department heads. What discipline is handled by | 6 | | |
| | 7 | | department heads and what must go through the | 7 | A. | Termination for one. I believe I'm not certain. |
| | 8 | | commissioners? | 8 | | One was termination, and I believe one was a |
| | 9 | A. | Lower level disciplines that don't have a monetary | 9 | | termination that was that was changed to a |
| | 10 | | impact on the employee are handled through the | 10 | | one was a termination and then it was corrected to |
| | 11 | | department heads, and those items that have a | 11 | | be an agreement. |
| | 12 | | monetary impact on the employee are decided based | 12 | | Who was terminated? |
| | 13 | | on the appointing authority. | 13 | | I can't remember the names of the employees. |
| | 14 | Q. | | 14 | | Man or woman? |
| | 15 | ٦. | can recall, and tell me if I'm wrong, is Richard | 15 | | There was a man and a woman. Middle I can't |
| | 16 | | Jackson, Mr. Cook, and the dog warden employee? | 16 | | remember the names specifically. I don't want to |
| | 17 | A. | Ma'am, that's not what you asked before. | 17 | | give the wrong name. |
| | 18 | Q. | · | 18 | | |
| | 19 | | new question, and I said tell me if I'm incorrect. | 19 | | letter? |
| | 20 | | The only three employees you can remember | 20 | | The man. |
| | 21 | | considering discipline for, whether union or not, | 21 | | And he was terminated had the terminated |
| | 22 | | is Richard Jackson, Mr. Cook and the dog warden | 22 | | employee had any prior discipline prior to being |
| | 23 | | employee; is that correct? | 23 | | terminated? |
| | 24 | Α. | | 24 | | I can't recall. |
| | 25 | | What other employees do you recall being considered | 25 | | Did Richard Jackson have any prior discipline |
| | 23 | Q. | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | 23 | Q. | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO |
| | | | 14 | | | 16 |
| | | | | | | |
| 02:42 | 1 | | | 02:47 1 | | |
| 02:43 | 1 | ٨ | for discipline by the commissioners? | 02:47 1 | ٨ | before he was terminated? |
| 02:43 | 2 | A. | for discipline by the commissioners? There were no other ones that were fiduciary. | 2 | | before he was terminated? I can't recall. |
| 02:43 | 2 | A. | for discipline by the commissioners? There were no other ones that were fiduciary. Are we no longer talking about those who are | 3 | _ | before he was terminated? I can't recall. MS. MINAHAN: Objection. |
| 02:43 | 2 3 4 | A. | for discipline by the commissioners? There were no other ones that were fiduciary. Are we no longer talking about those who are similar to Mr. Cook and now we're talking about | 2 3 4 | A. | before he was terminated? I can't recall. MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Oh, wait. I'm sorry. He wasn't terminated. |
| 02:43 | 2 3 4 5 | A. | for discipline by the commissioners? There were no other ones that were fiduciary. Are we no longer talking about those who are similar to Mr. Cook and now we're talking about lower level union employees, because that could | 2 3 4 5 | A. Q. | before he was terminated? I can't recall. MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Oh, wait. I'm sorry. He wasn't terminated. Was he given an opportunity to resign or retire in |
| 02:43 | 2 3 4 5 6 | | for discipline by the commissioners? There were no other ones that were fiduciary. Are we no longer talking about those who are similar to Mr. Cook and now we're talking about lower level union employees, because that could be | 2 3 4 5 6 | A. Q. | before he was terminated? I can't recall. MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Oh, wait. I'm sorry. He wasn't terminated. Was he given an opportunity to resign or retire in lieu of termination? |
| 02:43 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | A. Q. | for discipline by the commissioners? There were no other ones that were fiduciary. Are we no longer talking about those who are similar to Mr. Cook and now we're talking about lower level union employees, because that could be Ma'am, and I said regardless of whether union or | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | A. Q. A. | before he was terminated? I can't recall. MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Oh, wait. I'm sorry. He wasn't terminated. Was he given an opportunity to resign or retire in lieu of termination? No. Nor was there any pre-disciplinary conference |
| 02:43 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | | for discipline by the commissioners? There were no other ones that were fiduciary. Are we no longer talking about those who are similar to Mr. Cook and now we're talking about lower level union employees, because that could be Ma'am, and I said regardless of whether union or not. First it was nonunion, now I'm asking lower | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | A. Q. A. | before he was terminated? I can't recall. MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Oh, wait. I'm sorry. He wasn't terminated. Was he given an opportunity to resign or retire in lieu of termination? No. Nor was there any pre-disciplinary conference because he's a fiduciary. There is a difference. |
| | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | for discipline by the commissioners? There were no other ones that were fiduciary. Are we no longer talking about those who are similar to Mr. Cook and now we're talking about lower level union employees, because that could be Ma'am, and I said regardless of whether union or not. First it was nonunion, now I'm asking lower level, mid level, upper level, whatever level you | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | A. Q. A. | before he was terminated? I can't recall. MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Oh, wait. I'm sorry. He wasn't terminated. Was he given an opportunity to resign or retire in lieu of termination? No. Nor was there any pre-disciplinary conference because he's a fiduciary. There is a difference. There is nothing in the handbook about fiduciaries |
| | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | for discipline by the commissioners? There were no other ones that were fiduciary. Are we no longer talking about those who are similar to Mr. Cook and now we're talking about lower level union employees, because that could be Ma'am, and I said regardless of whether union or not. First it was nonunion, now I'm asking lower level, mid level, upper level, whatever level you want to imagine, any level employee that the | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A. Q. A. Q. | before he was terminated? I can't recall. MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Oh, wait. I'm sorry. He wasn't terminated. Was he given an opportunity to resign or retire in lieu of termination? No. Nor was there any pre-disciplinary conference because he's a fiduciary. There is a difference. There is nothing in the handbook about fiduciaries foregoing the right to a pre-disciplinary |
| | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | | for discipline by the commissioners? There were no other ones that were fiduciary. Are we no longer talking about those who are similar to Mr. Cook and now we're talking about lower level union employees, because that could be Ma'am, and I said regardless of whether union or not. First it was nonunion, now I'm asking lower level, mid level, upper level, whatever level you want to imagine, any level employee that the commissioners have considered for discipline, since | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | A. Q. A. Q. | before he was terminated? I can't recall. MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Oh, wait. I'm sorry. He wasn't terminated. Was he given an opportunity to resign or retire in lieu of termination? No. Nor was there any pre-disciplinary conference because he's a fiduciary. There is a difference. There is nothing in the handbook about fiduciaries foregoing the right to a pre-disciplinary conference, is there? |
| | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | | for discipline by the commissioners? There were no other ones that were fiduciary. Are we no longer talking about those who are similar to Mr. Cook and now we're talking about lower level union employees, because that could be Ma'am, and I said regardless of whether union or not. First it was nonunion, now I'm asking lower level, mid level, upper level, whatever level you want to imagine, any level employee that the commissioners have considered for discipline, since you have been a commissioner, other than those | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | A. Q. A. Q. | before he was terminated? I can't recall. MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Oh, wait. I'm sorry. He wasn't terminated. Was he given an opportunity to resign or retire in lieu of termination? No. Nor was there any pre-disciplinary conference because he's a fiduciary. There is a difference. There is nothing in the handbook about fiduciaries foregoing the right to a pre-disciplinary conference, is there? I can't recall. I do know that we go by the law |
| | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. | for discipline by the commissioners? There were no other ones that were fiduciary. Are we no longer talking about those who are similar to Mr. Cook and now we're talking about lower level union employees, because that could be Ma'am, and I said regardless of whether union or not. First it was nonunion, now I'm asking lower level, mid level, upper level, whatever level you want to imagine, any level employee that the commissioners have considered for discipline, since you have been a commissioner, other than those three individuals? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | A. Q. A. Q. | before he was terminated? I can't recall. MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Oh, wait. I'm sorry. He wasn't terminated. Was he given an opportunity to resign or retire in lieu of termination? No. Nor was there any pre-disciplinary conference because he's a fiduciary. There is a difference. There is nothing in the handbook about fiduciaries foregoing the right to a pre-disciplinary conference, is there? I can't recall. I do know that we go by the law and our policy can't necessarily supersede the |
| | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. | for discipline by the commissioners? There were no other ones that were fiduciary. Are we no longer talking about those who are similar to Mr. Cook and now we're talking about lower level union employees, because that could be Ma'am, and I said regardless of whether union or not. First it was nonunion, now I'm asking lower level, mid level, upper level, whatever level you want to imagine, any level employee that the commissioners have considered for discipline, since you have been a commissioner, other than those three individuals? So what was the question? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | A. Q. A. Q. | before he was terminated? I can't recall. MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Oh, wait. I'm sorry. He wasn't terminated. Was he given an opportunity to resign or retire in lieu of termination? No. Nor was there any pre-disciplinary conference because he's a fiduciary. There is a difference. There is nothing in the handbook about fiduciaries foregoing the right to a pre-disciplinary conference, is there? I can't recall. I do know that we go by the law and our policy can't necessarily supersede the revised code so |
| | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. A. Q. | for discipline by the commissioners? There were no other ones that were fiduciary. Are we no longer talking about those who are similar to Mr. Cook and now we're talking about lower level union employees, because that could be Ma'am, and I said regardless of whether union or not. First it was nonunion, now I'm asking lower level, mid level, upper level, whatever level you want to imagine, any level employee that the commissioners have considered for discipline, since you have been a commissioner, other than those three individuals? So what was the question? Discipline considered by the commissioners? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | A. Q. A. | before he was terminated? I can't recall. MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Oh, wait. I'm sorry. He wasn't terminated. Was he given an opportunity to resign or retire in lieu of termination? No. Nor was there any pre-disciplinary conference because he's a fiduciary. There is a difference. There is nothing in the handbook about fiduciaries foregoing the right to a pre-disciplinary conference, is there? I can't recall. I do know that we go by the law and our policy can't necessarily supersede the revised code so MS. GROEDEL: Move to strike. |
| | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. | for discipline by the commissioners? There were no other ones that were fiduciary. Are we no longer talking about those who are similar to Mr. Cook and now we're talking about lower level union employees, because that could be Ma'am, and I said regardless of whether union or not. First it was nonunion, now I'm asking lower level, mid level, upper level, whatever level you want to imagine, any level employee that the commissioners have considered for discipline, since you have been a commissioner, other than those three individuals? So what was the question? Discipline considered by the commissioners? That was a statement. Can you give me a question, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | A. Q. A. Q. | before he was terminated? I can't recall. MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Oh, wait. I'm sorry. He wasn't terminated. Was he given an opportunity to resign or retire in lieu of termination? No. Nor was there any pre-disciplinary conference because he's a fiduciary. There is a difference. There is nothing in the handbook about fiduciaries foregoing the right to a pre-disciplinary conference, is there? I can't recall. I do know that we go by the law and our policy can't necessarily supersede the revised code so MS. GROEDEL: Move to strike. And I am going to ask you to answer my question. |
| | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. A. Q. A. | for discipline by the commissioners? There were no other ones that were fiduciary. Are we no longer talking about those who are similar to Mr. Cook and now we're talking about lower level union employees, because that could be Ma'am, and I said regardless of whether union or not. First it was nonunion, now I'm asking lower level, mid level, upper level, whatever level you want to imagine, any level employee that the commissioners have considered for discipline, since you have been a commissioner, other than those three individuals? So what was the question? Discipline considered by the commissioners? That was a statement. Can you give me a question, please? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A. Q. A. Q. | I can't recall. MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Oh, wait. I'm sorry. He wasn't terminated. Was he given an opportunity to resign or retire in lieu of termination? No. Nor was there any pre-disciplinary conference because he's a fiduciary. There is a difference. There is nothing in the handbook about fiduciaries foregoing the right to a pre-disciplinary conference, is there? I can't recall. I do know that we go by the law and our policy can't necessarily supersede the revised code so MS. GROEDEL: Move to strike. And I am going to ask you to answer my question. And if you don't know, just say so, ma'am. |
| | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. A. Q. | for discipline by the commissioners? There were no other ones that were fiduciary. Are we no longer talking about those who are similar to Mr. Cook and now we're talking about lower level union employees, because that could be Ma'am, and I said regardless of whether union or not. First it was nonunion, now I'm asking lower level, mid level, upper level, whatever level you want to imagine, any level employee that the commissioners have considered for discipline, since you have been a commissioner, other than those three individuals? So what was the question? Discipline considered by the commissioners? That was a statement. Can you give me a question, please? What employees do you recall the commissioners | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | A. Q. A. Q. A. | before he was terminated? I can't recall. MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Oh, wait. I'm sorry. He wasn't terminated. Was he given an opportunity to resign or retire in lieu of termination? No. Nor was there any pre-disciplinary conference because he's a fiduciary. There is a difference. There is nothing in the handbook about fiduciaries foregoing the right to a pre-disciplinary conference, is there? I can't recall. I do know that we go by the law and our policy can't necessarily supersede the revised code so MS. GROEDEL: Move to strike. And I am going to ask you to answer my question. And if you don't know, just say so, ma'am. Okay. I don't know. I can't recall. |
| | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Q. A. Q. A. | for discipline by the commissioners? There were no other ones that were fiduciary. Are we no longer talking about those who are similar to Mr. Cook and now we're talking about lower level union employees, because that could be Ma'am, and I said regardless of whether union or not. First it was nonunion, now I'm asking lower level, mid level, upper level, whatever level you want to imagine, any level employee that the commissioners have considered for discipline, since you have been a commissioner, other than those three individuals? So what was the question? Discipline considered by the commissioners? That was a statement. Can you give me a question, please? What employees do you recall the commissioners considering for discipline since you have been a | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A. Q. A. Q. | I can't recall. MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Oh, wait. I'm sorry. He wasn't terminated. Was he given an opportunity to resign or retire in lieu of termination? No. Nor was there any pre-disciplinary conference because he's a fiduciary. There is a difference. There is nothing in the handbook about fiduciaries foregoing the right to a pre-disciplinary conference, is there? I can't recall. I do know that we go by the law and our policy can't necessarily supersede the revised code so MS. GROEDEL: Move to strike. And I am going to ask you to answer my question. And if you don't know, just say so, ma'am. Okay. I don't know. I can't recall. Are there any other employees you recall the |
| | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. A. Q. A. | for discipline by the commissioners? There were no other ones that were fiduciary. Are we no longer talking about those who are similar to Mr. Cook and now we're talking about lower level union employees, because that could be Ma'am, and I said regardless of whether union or not. First it was nonunion, now I'm asking lower level, mid level, upper level, whatever level you want to imagine, any level employee that the commissioners have considered for discipline, since you have been a commissioner, other than those three individuals? So what was the question? Discipline considered by the commissioners? That was a statement. Can you give me a question, please? What employees do you recall the commissioners considering for discipline since you have been a commissioner? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | A. Q. A. Q. | I can't recall. MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Oh, wait. I'm sorry. He wasn't terminated. Was he given an opportunity to resign or retire in lieu of termination? No. Nor was there any pre-disciplinary conference because he's a fiduciary. There is a difference. There is nothing in the handbook about fiduciaries foregoing the right to a pre-disciplinary conference, is there? I can't recall. I do know that we go by the law and our policy can't necessarily supersede the revised code so MS. GROEDEL: Move to strike. And I am going to ask you to answer my question. And if you don't know, just say so, ma'am. Okay. I don't know. I can't recall. Are there any other employees you recall the commissioners considering for discipline oh, |
| | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. A. Q. A. | for discipline by the commissioners? There were no other ones that were fiduciary. Are we no longer talking about those who are similar to Mr. Cook and now we're talking about lower level union employees, because that could be Ma'am, and I said regardless of whether union or not. First it was nonunion, now I'm asking lower level, mid level, upper level, whatever level you want to imagine, any level employee that the commissioners have considered for discipline, since you have been a commissioner, other than those three individuals? So what was the question? Discipline considered by the commissioners? That was a statement. Can you give me a question, please? What employees do you recall the commissioners considering for discipline since you have been a commissioner? The one the most recent one was the dog kennel | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A. Q. A. Q. A. | I can't recall. MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Oh, wait. I'm sorry. He wasn't terminated. Was he given an opportunity to resign or retire in lieu of termination? No. Nor was there any pre-disciplinary conference because he's a fiduciary. There is a difference. There is nothing in the handbook about fiduciaries foregoing the right to a pre-disciplinary conference, is there? I can't recall. I do know that we go by the law and our policy can't necessarily supersede the revised code so MS. GROEDEL: Move to strike. And I am going to ask you to answer my question. And if you don't know, just say so, ma'am. Okay. I don't know. I can't recall. Are there any other employees you recall the commissioners considering for discipline oh, yes, you mentioned the Job & Family Services |
| | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. A. Q. A. | There were no other ones that were fiduciary. Are we no longer talking about those who are similar to Mr. Cook and now we're talking about lower level union employees, because that could be Ma'am, and I said regardless of whether union or not. First it was nonunion, now I'm asking lower level, mid level, upper level, whatever level you want to imagine, any level employee that the commissioners have considered for discipline, since you have been a commissioner, other than those three individuals? So what was the question? Discipline considered by the commissioners? That was a statement. Can you give me a question, please? What employees do you recall the commissioners considering for discipline since you have been a commissioner? The one the most recent one was the dog kennel employee. I don't recall names either. I remember | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | A. Q. A. Q. | I can't recall. MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Oh, wait. I'm sorry. He wasn't terminated. Was he given an opportunity to resign or retire in lieu of termination? No. Nor was there any pre-disciplinary conference because he's a fiduciary. There is a difference. There is nothing in the handbook about fiduciaries foregoing the right to a pre-disciplinary conference, is there? I can't recall. I do know that we go by the law and our policy can't necessarily supersede the revised code so MS. GROEDEL: Move to strike. And I am going to ask you to answer my question. And if you don't know, just say so, ma'am. Okay. I don't know. I can't recall. Are there any other employees you recall the commissioners considering for discipline oh, yes, you mentioned the Job & Family Services employee. Was it a him or a her? |
| | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. A. Q. A. | There were no other ones that were fiduciary. Are we no longer talking about those who are similar to Mr. Cook and now we're talking about lower level union employees, because that could be Ma'am, and I said regardless of whether union or not. First it was nonunion, now I'm asking lower level, mid level, upper level, whatever level you want to imagine, any level employee that the commissioners have considered for discipline, since you have been a commissioner, other than those three individuals? So what was the question? Discipline considered by the commissioners? That was a statement. Can you give me a question, please? What employees do you recall the commissioners considering for discipline since you have been a commissioner? The one the most recent one was the dog kennel employee. I don't recall names either. I remember there was another 911 employee. There might have | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A. Q. A. Q. | I can't recall. MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Oh, wait. I'm sorry. He wasn't terminated. Was he given an opportunity to resign or retire in lieu of termination? No. Nor was there any pre-disciplinary conference because he's a fiduciary. There is a difference. There is nothing in the handbook about fiduciaries foregoing the right to a pre-disciplinary conference, is there? I can't recall. I do know that we go by the law and our policy can't necessarily supersede the revised code so MS. GROEDEL: Move to strike. And I am going to ask you to answer my question. And if you don't know, just say so, ma'am. Okay. I don't know. I can't recall. Are there any other employees you recall the commissioners considering for discipline oh, yes, you mentioned the Job & Family Services employee. Was it a him or a her? I can't recall. |
| | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | Q. A. Q. A. | There were no other ones that were fiduciary. Are we no longer talking about those who are similar to Mr. Cook and now we're talking about lower level union employees, because that could be Ma'am, and I said regardless of whether union or not. First it was nonunion, now I'm asking lower level, mid level, upper level, whatever level you want to imagine, any level employee that the commissioners have considered for discipline, since you have been a commissioner, other than those three individuals? So what was the question? Discipline considered by the commissioners? That was a statement. Can you give me a question, please? What employees do you recall the commissioners considering for discipline since you have been a commissioner? The one the most recent one was the dog kennel employee. I don't recall names either. I remember there was another 911 employees. There might have been two other 911 employees. There have been I | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. | I can't recall. MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Oh, wait. I'm sorry. He wasn't terminated. Was he given an opportunity to resign or retire in lieu of termination? No. Nor was there any pre-disciplinary conference because he's a fiduciary. There is a difference. There is nothing in the handbook about fiduciaries foregoing the right to a pre-disciplinary conference, is there? I can't recall. I do know that we go by the law and our policy can't necessarily supersede the revised code so MS. GROEDEL: Move to strike. And I am going to ask you to answer my question. And if you don't know, just say so, ma'am. Okay. I don't know. I can't recall. Are there any other employees you recall the commissioners considering for discipline oh, yes, you mentioned the Job & Family Services employee. Was it a him or a her? I can't recall. And what was the accusation of against this |
| | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. A. Q. A. | There were no other ones that were fiduciary. Are we no longer talking about those who are similar to Mr. Cook and now we're talking about lower level union employees, because that could be Ma'am, and I said regardless of whether union or not. First it was nonunion, now I'm asking lower level, mid level, upper level, whatever level you want to imagine, any level employee that the commissioners have considered for discipline, since you have been a commissioner, other than those three individuals? So what was the question? Discipline considered by the commissioners? That was a statement. Can you give me a question, please? What employees do you recall the commissioners considering for discipline since you have been a commissioner? The one the most recent one was the dog kennel employee. I don't recall names either. I remember there was another 911 employee. There might have | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. | I can't recall. MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Oh, wait. I'm sorry. He wasn't terminated. Was he given an opportunity to resign or retire in lieu of termination? No. Nor was there any pre-disciplinary conference because he's a fiduciary. There is a difference. There is nothing in the handbook about fiduciaries foregoing the right to a pre-disciplinary conference, is there? I can't recall. I do know that we go by the law and our policy can't necessarily supersede the revised code so MS. GROEDEL: Move to strike. And I am going to ask you to answer my question. And if you don't know, just say so, ma'am. Okay. I don't know. I can't recall. Are there any other employees you recall the commissioners considering for discipline oh, yes, you mentioned the Job & Family Services employee. Was it a him or a her? I can't recall. |

| | | | 17 | | | | 19 |
|-------|----------|----|---|-------|----------|----|---|
| 02:49 | 1 | A. | Not responding to a call in a timely manner, to the | 02:54 | 1 | | with respect to the progressive discipline, if |
| | 2 | | best of my recollection, to a customer. Leaving | | 2 | | they're classified. |
| | 3 | | someone on hold too long, as far as I can recall. | | 3 | | But if they're nonclassified it's completely |
| | 4 | Q. | And was this person terminated? | | 4 | | different. So theirs follows more similarly to the |
| | 5 | A. | No. | | 5 | | process that the unions follow. |
| | 6 | Q. | What was the discipline imposed? | | 6 | Q. | Are they bound by the same handbook that the rest |
| | 7 | | I can't recall with certainty. | | 7 | | of the employees are bound by? |
| | 8 | Q. | Had the employee been subject to prior discipline? | | 8 | A. | Yes. |
| | 9 | | I don't know. | | 9 | Q. | And whether they're union or nonunion, if the |
| 1 | 10 | Q. | Are there any other employees you can recall being | | 10 | | department head takes an action that has a monetary |
| 1 | 11 | | subject to discipline, whether union or nonunion, | | 11 | | component, I believe, tell me if that's not the |
| 1 | 12 | | mid, low or high level employees, other than those | | 12 | | right word, the ultimate decision must be made by |
| - | 13 | | you have mentioned? | | 13 | | the commissioners? |
| | - | Α. | I believe there were two that I can recall. But, | | 14 | Α. | Well, pursuant to the revised code if there is a |
| - | 15 | | no, not they were not I see what you are | | 15 | | suspension, paid or unpaid, it's required that that |
| - | 16 | | saying. | | 16 | | come through as something on our agenda that the |
| 1 | 17 | | Yes, I recall two more. And, again, I wasn't | | 17 | | commissioners vote on, and that's pursuant to the |
| | 18 | | prepared for this number, so things might come to | | 18 | | revised code. |
| | 19 | | me. | | 19 | | So that's why I was saying before that our |
| | 20 | Q. | I'm asking to the best of your recollection. | | 20 | | rules can't supercede what the revised code is, |
| 1 | 21 | | Okay. | | 21 | | that's 124.388. |
| | 22 | | I appreciate that. | | 22 | Q. | So you're saying even if it doesn't have a monetary |
| | 23 | | What are the other two situations you remember? | | 23 | - | component because someone is suspended with pay, it |
| | | Α. | One of them did some political work, and there was | | 24 | | still has to go through the commissioners? |
| | 25 | | a verbal warning, I believe, on the workday, and | | 25 | Α. | Yes. If it's if they're placed on any type of |
| | _ | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO |
| | | | 18 | | | | 20 |
| 02:52 | 1 | | they got a verbal warning. I don't even that's | 02:56 | 1 | | administrative leave. |
| | 2 | | one. | | 2 | Q. | And that's |
| | 3 | | One of them was taking photographs and using | | 3 | A. | I'm sorry, I wanted to be clear. But the monetary |
| | 4 | | them for social media and sharing them on the clock | | 4 | | impact would relate to even if someone were given |
| | 5 | | from the workplace, something to that effect. I | | 5 | | one day of unpaid leave, it would come through to |
| | 6 | | believe it was a verbal. | | 6 | | the commissioners, even if it were just one day |
| | 7 | | And another employee, just recently, in our | | 7 | | because it has a monetary impact. |
| | 8 | | office for using inappropriate language to a | | 8 | Q. | Even if it's one day with leave with pay because |
| | 9 | | superior, and got a verbal warning, too. But when | | 9 | A. | Yes. Yes. |
| 1 | 10 | | they're union and they're verbal after so long they | | 10 | Q. | Got it. |
| 1 | 11 | | get pulled, so you wouldn't even be able to see | | 11 | | Okay. Now let's talk about the subjects do |
| 1 | 12 | | that they existed. | | 12 | | you have a copy of the complaint and the answer to |
| 1 | 13 | Q. | Which ones of those three, the inappropriate | | 13 | | talk about the defenses? |
| 1 | 14 | | language, the political work for a fundraiser | | 14 | A. | I have the questions that you that were on that |
| 1 | 15 | | during work, and the taking photos and posting them | | 15 | | original e-mail that you sent, and I do have the |
| 1 | 16 | | while on the clock, were union? | | 16 | | defenses. I have everything that I indicated |
| 1 | 17 | A. | All of them. | | 17 | | initially that I was prepared to respond to. |
| 1 | 18 | Q. | Is there any other difference in discipline between | | 18 | Q. | Okay. So let's look at the answer to the amended |
| 1 | 19 | | the union and nonunion in terms of other than | | 19 | | complaint which was filed on October 20th of 2020 |
| 2 | 20 | | than if you're union the verbal warnings disappear | | 20 | | yeah, October 20th, 2022, sorry. |
| 2 | 21 | | after a certain amount of time from the personnel | | 21 | | Do you have that front of you, ma'am? |
| 2 | 22 | | file? | | 22 | A. | Yes. I have everything that you that you are |
| 2 | | _ | Classified employees are still different than the | | 23 | | asking me questions about printed. |
| 1 | 23 | Α. | classified employees are sun unferent than the | | | | |
| 2 | 23 24 | Α. | department heads, the fiduciary ones, so those ones | | 24 | Q. | Good. Excellent. |
| | | A. | | | 24 25 | Q. | Good. Excellent. MS. GROEDEL: Then I will mark this as |

| | | 21 | | | 23 |
|--|----|---|-------|--|--|
| 02:58 1 | | Exhibit 2, and I will send it to Kelli. | 03:03 | 1 A | . No. Nothing and you are talking about no. |
| 2 | Q. | I'll send it to you, too, just so we have it. | | 2 Q | . The only thing you did was speak to Kathleen about |
| 3 | | | | 3 | it? |
| 4 | | (Plaintiff's Exhibit 2 was marked for purposes of | | 4 A | . Yes. |
| 5 | | identification.) | | 5 Q | . Okay. Let's look at the Eighth Defense. |
| 6 | | | | 6 A | . Oh, okay. We're skipping to the Eighth. Okay. |
| 7 | Q. | Here you go. Let me know when you receive it. | | 7 Q | Did you what is the basis for this defense? |
| 8 | A. | I have it, and it opened. | | 8 A | . Well, he would not have been entitled to |
| 9 | Q. | Do you have it? | | 9 | reinstatement due to his actions. |
| 10 | A. | Yes. | | 10 Q | . And is that in a policy or a procedure? |
| 11 | Q. | Good. | | 11 A | . He wouldn't have passed our background check. |
| 12 | | What is the basis for the Second Affirmative | | 12 Q | . Okay. My question was let me rephrase it. |
| 13 | | Defense that plaintiff failed to mitigate his | | 13 | Before he was terminated, what are you |
| 14 | | damages? | | 14 | referring to? He wouldn't have been entitled to |
| 15 | A. | We don't know if he made a good faith effort to | | 15 | reinstatement, I'm not asking about reinstatement, |
| 16 | | find new employment. We don't know that he sought | | 16 | I'm talking about his termination. |
| 17 | | other employments, that he had how vigilant he | | 17 A | . About his termination? What is your question |
| 18 | | was in those efforts either. | | 18 | specifically? I apologize. |
| 19 | Q. | Have you seen any documents he has produced? | | 19 Q | . It's okay. What is the basis for this defense? |
| 20 | A. | I have not. I am aware of one interview. | 2 | 20 A | . The unclean hands. |
| 21 | Q. | Okay. So my question is do you know if he | 2 | 21 Q | . Right. |
| 22 | | submitted any documents in his litigation about his | 2 | 22 A | . His conduct. I mean, his behavior and his actions |
| 23 | | mitigation any mitigation efforts? | 2 | 23 | and the incident that he was involved in caused him |
| 24 | A. | I don't know. | 2 | 24 | to be in this situation. It was his own doings. |
| 25 | Q. | What steps did you take to determine whether | 2 | 25 | His hands were not clean. But for the fact that |
| | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO |
| | | | | | |
| | | 22 | | | 24 |
| 03:01 1 | | 22 Mr. Cook made any efforts to mitigate his damages? | 03:06 | 1 | 24 all of this controversy came up surrounding |
| 03:01 1 | A. | | 03:06 | 1 2 | |
| | A. | Mr. Cook made any efforts to mitigate his damages? | 03:06 | | all of this controversy came up surrounding |
| 2 | A. | Mr. Cook made any efforts to mitigate his damages? I asked I spoke with our counsel to find out if | 03:06 | 2 | all of this controversy came up surrounding surrounding the him hitting the person on the |
| 3 | | Mr. Cook made any efforts to mitigate his damages? I asked I spoke with our counsel to find out if there was anything responsive that would cause | 03:06 | 2 | all of this controversy came up surrounding surrounding the him hitting the person on the skateboard and the hit-skip and all of that, we |
| 3 4 | | Mr. Cook made any efforts to mitigate his damages? I asked I spoke with our counsel to find out if there was anything responsive that would cause that would cause the response to be anything | 03:06 | 2 3 4 | all of this controversy came up surrounding surrounding the him hitting the person on the skateboard and the hit-skip and all of that, we wouldn't have had it come to this. |
| 2 3 4 5 | | Mr. Cook made any efforts to mitigate his damages? I asked I spoke with our counsel to find out if there was anything responsive that would cause that would cause the response to be anything otherwise, and I was made aware of one interview, | 03:06 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | all of this controversy came up surrounding surrounding the him hitting the person on the skateboard and the hit-skip and all of that, we wouldn't have had it come to this. Though there were also other issues with the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | | Mr. Cook made any efforts to mitigate his damages? I asked I spoke with our counsel to find out if there was anything responsive that would cause that would cause the response to be anything otherwise, and I was made aware of one interview, which, to me, sounds like not enough information | 03:06 | 2 3 4 5 6 | all of this controversy came up surrounding surrounding the him hitting the person on the skateboard and the hit-skip and all of that, we wouldn't have had it come to this. Though there were also other issues with the with the employment that we discussed in my |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | | Mr. Cook made any efforts to mitigate his damages? I asked I spoke with our counsel to find out if there was anything responsive that would cause that would cause the response to be anything otherwise, and I was made aware of one interview, which, to me, sounds like not enough information for us to determine if he made a good faith effort. MS. MINAHAN: And, obviously, the answer to the amended complaint was filed | | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | all of this controversy came up surrounding surrounding the him hitting the person on the skateboard and the hit-skip and all of that, we wouldn't have had it come to this. Though there were also other issues with the with the employment that we discussed in my depositions. Everything was a result of his own actions. He wasn't some exemplary, stellar employee, especially as a result of what happened |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | Mr. Cook made any efforts to mitigate his damages? I asked I spoke with our counsel to find out if there was anything responsive that would cause that would cause the response to be anything otherwise, and I was made aware of one interview, which, to me, sounds like not enough information for us to determine if he made a good faith effort. MS. MINAHAN: And, obviously, the answer to the amended complaint was filed months ago, so your question is locked in time | | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | all of this controversy came up surrounding surrounding the him hitting the person on the skateboard and the hit-skip and all of that, we wouldn't have had it come to this. Though there were also other issues with the with the employment that we discussed in my depositions. Everything was a result of his own actions. He wasn't some exemplary, stellar employee, especially as a result of what happened with that incident, and actually it was quite an |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | | Mr. Cook made any efforts to mitigate his damages? I asked I spoke with our counsel to find out if there was anything responsive that would cause that would cause the response to be anything otherwise, and I was made aware of one interview, which, to me, sounds like not enough information for us to determine if he made a good faith effort. MS. MINAHAN: And, obviously, the answer to the amended complaint was filed months ago, so your question is locked in time to when that answer was filed. | | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | all of this controversy came up surrounding surrounding the him hitting the person on the skateboard and the hit-skip and all of that, we wouldn't have had it come to this. Though there were also other issues with the with the employment that we discussed in my depositions. Everything was a result of his own actions. He wasn't some exemplary, stellar employee, especially as a result of what happened with that incident, and actually it was quite an embarrassment and bad for the county. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | | Mr. Cook made any efforts to mitigate his damages? I asked I spoke with our counsel to find out if there was anything responsive that would cause that would cause the response to be anything otherwise, and I was made aware of one interview, which, to me, sounds like not enough information for us to determine if he made a good faith effort. MS. MINAHAN: And, obviously, the answer to the amended complaint was filed months ago, so your question is locked in time to when that answer was filed. MS. GROEDEL: Okay. Well, I was not | | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | all of this controversy came up surrounding surrounding the him hitting the person on the skateboard and the hit-skip and all of that, we wouldn't have had it come to this. Though there were also other issues with the with the employment that we discussed in my depositions. Everything was a result of his own actions. He wasn't some exemplary, stellar employee, especially as a result of what happened with that incident, and actually it was quite an embarrassment and bad for the county. We talked about the embarrassment stuff. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | | Mr. Cook made any efforts to mitigate his damages? I asked I spoke with our counsel to find out if there was anything responsive that would cause that would cause the response to be anything otherwise, and I was made aware of one interview, which, to me, sounds like not enough information for us to determine if he made a good faith effort. MS. MINAHAN: And, obviously, the answer to the amended complaint was filed months ago, so your question is locked in time to when that answer was filed. MS. GROEDEL: Okay. Well, I was not done asking if she reviewed anything to | | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 Q | all of this controversy came up surrounding surrounding the him hitting the person on the skateboard and the hit-skip and all of that, we wouldn't have had it come to this. Though there were also other issues with the with the employment that we discussed in my depositions. Everything was a result of his own actions. He wasn't some exemplary, stellar employee, especially as a result of what happened with that incident, and actually it was quite an embarrassment and bad for the county. We talked about the embarrassment stuff. So my question is in furtherance of this, he |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | | Mr. Cook made any efforts to mitigate his damages? I asked I spoke with our counsel to find out if there was anything responsive that would cause that would cause the response to be anything otherwise, and I was made aware of one interview, which, to me, sounds like not enough information for us to determine if he made a good faith effort. MS. MINAHAN: And, obviously, the answer to the amended complaint was filed months ago, so your question is locked in time to when that answer was filed. MS. GROEDEL: Okay. Well, I was not done asking if she reviewed anything to determine whether or not this is an accurate | | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 Q | all of this controversy came up surrounding surrounding the him hitting the person on the skateboard and the hit-skip and all of that, we wouldn't have had it come to this. Though there were also other issues with the with the employment that we discussed in my depositions. Everything was a result of his own actions. He wasn't some exemplary, stellar employee, especially as a result of what happened with that incident, and actually it was quite an embarrassment and bad for the county. We talked about the embarrassment stuff. So my question is in furtherance of this, he could have been warned or had some lesser form of |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | | Mr. Cook made any efforts to mitigate his damages? I asked I spoke with our counsel to find out if there was anything responsive that would cause that would cause the response to be anything otherwise, and I was made aware of one interview, which, to me, sounds like not enough information for us to determine if he made a good faith effort. MS. MINAHAN: And, obviously, the answer to the amended complaint was filed months ago, so your question is locked in time to when that answer was filed. MS. GROEDEL: Okay. Well, I was not done asking if she reviewed anything to determine whether or not this is an accurate still an accurate affirmative defense. | | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 Q 13 14 | all of this controversy came up surrounding surrounding the him hitting the person on the skateboard and the hit-skip and all of that, we wouldn't have had it come to this. Though there were also other issues with the with the employment that we discussed in my depositions. Everything was a result of his own actions. He wasn't some exemplary, stellar employee, especially as a result of what happened with that incident, and actually it was quite an embarrassment and bad for the county. We talked about the embarrassment stuff. So my question is in furtherance of this, he could have been warned or had some lesser form of discipline under the progressive discipline policy; |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | | Mr. Cook made any efforts to mitigate his damages? I asked I spoke with our counsel to find out if there was anything responsive that would cause that would cause the response to be anything otherwise, and I was made aware of one interview, which, to me, sounds like not enough information for us to determine if he made a good faith effort. MS. MINAHAN: And, obviously, the answer to the amended complaint was filed months ago, so your question is locked in time to when that answer was filed. MS. GROEDEL: Okay. Well, I was not done asking if she reviewed anything to determine whether or not this is an accurate still an accurate affirmative defense. MS. MINAHAN: But the question is was | | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 Q 13 14 15 | all of this controversy came up surrounding surrounding the him hitting the person on the skateboard and the hit-skip and all of that, we wouldn't have had it come to this. Though there were also other issues with the with the employment that we discussed in my depositions. Everything was a result of his own actions. He wasn't some exemplary, stellar employee, especially as a result of what happened with that incident, and actually it was quite an embarrassment and bad for the county. We talked about the embarrassment stuff. So my question is in furtherance of this, he could have been warned or had some lesser form of discipline under the progressive discipline policy; correct? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | | Mr. Cook made any efforts to mitigate his damages? I asked I spoke with our counsel to find out if there was anything responsive that would cause that would cause the response to be anything otherwise, and I was made aware of one interview, which, to me, sounds like not enough information for us to determine if he made a good faith effort. MS. MINAHAN: And, obviously, the answer to the amended complaint was filed months ago, so your question is locked in time to when that answer was filed. MS. GROEDEL: Okay. Well, I was not done asking if she reviewed anything to determine whether or not this is an accurate still an accurate affirmative defense. MS. MINAHAN: But the question is was it accurate when it was filed? | | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 Q 13 14 15 16 | all of this controversy came up surrounding surrounding the him hitting the person on the skateboard and the hit-skip and all of that, we wouldn't have had it come to this. Though there were also other issues with the with the employment that we discussed in my depositions. Everything was a result of his own actions. He wasn't some exemplary, stellar employee, especially as a result of what happened with that incident, and actually it was quite an embarrassment and bad for the county. We talked about the embarrassment stuff. So my question is in furtherance of this, he could have been warned or had some lesser form of discipline under the progressive discipline policy; correct? Can you ask this again, please? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | | Mr. Cook made any efforts to mitigate his damages? I asked I spoke with our counsel to find out if there was anything responsive that would cause that would cause the response to be anything otherwise, and I was made aware of one interview, which, to me, sounds like not enough information for us to determine if he made a good faith effort. MS. MINAHAN: And, obviously, the answer to the amended complaint was filed months ago, so your question is locked in time to when that answer was filed. MS. GROEDEL: Okay. Well, I was not done asking if she reviewed anything to determine whether or not this is an accurate still an accurate affirmative defense. MS. MINAHAN: But the question is was it accurate when it was filed? MS. GROEDEL: It says right on here | | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 Q 13 14 15 16 17 A | all of this controversy came up surrounding surrounding the him hitting the person on the skateboard and the hit-skip and all of that, we wouldn't have had it come to this. Though there were also other issues with the with the employment that we discussed in my depositions. Everything was a result of his own actions. He wasn't some exemplary, stellar employee, especially as a result of what happened with that incident, and actually it was quite an embarrassment and bad for the county. We talked about the embarrassment stuff. So my question is in furtherance of this, he could have been warned or had some lesser form of discipline under the progressive discipline policy; correct? Can you ask this again, please? He could have been subject to progressive |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | | Mr. Cook made any efforts to mitigate his damages? I asked I spoke with our counsel to find out if there was anything responsive that would cause that would cause the response to be anything otherwise, and I was made aware of one interview, which, to me, sounds like not enough information for us to determine if he made a good faith effort. MS. MINAHAN: And, obviously, the answer to the amended complaint was filed months ago, so your question is locked in time to when that answer was filed. MS. GROEDEL: Okay. Well, I was not done asking if she reviewed anything to determine whether or not this is an accurate still an accurate affirmative defense. MS. MINAHAN: But the question is was it accurate when it was filed? MS. GROEDEL: It says right on here when it was filed. | | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 Q 13 14 15 16 17 A | all of this controversy came up surrounding surrounding the him hitting the person on the skateboard and the hit-skip and all of that, we wouldn't have had it come to this. Though there were also other issues with the with the employment that we discussed in my depositions. Everything was a result of his own actions. He wasn't some exemplary, stellar employee, especially as a result of what happened with that incident, and actually it was quite an embarrassment and bad for the county. We talked about the embarrassment stuff. So my question is in furtherance of this, he could have been warned or had some lesser form of discipline under the progressive discipline policy; correct? Can you ask this again, please? He could have been subject to progressive discipline under the progressive discipline policy; |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | | Mr. Cook made any efforts to mitigate his damages? I asked I spoke with our counsel to find out if there was anything responsive that would cause that would cause the response to be anything otherwise, and I was made aware of one interview, which, to me, sounds like not enough information for us to determine if he made a good faith effort. MS. MINAHAN: And, obviously, the answer to the amended complaint was filed months ago, so your question is locked in time to when that answer was filed. MS. GROEDEL: Okay. Well, I was not done asking if she reviewed anything to determine whether or not this is an accurate still an accurate affirmative defense. MS. MINAHAN: But the question is was it accurate when it was filed? MS. GROEDEL: It says right on here when it was filed. MS. MINAHAN: Correct. | | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 Q 13 14 15 16 17 A 18 Q | all of this controversy came up surrounding surrounding the him hitting the person on the skateboard and the hit-skip and all of that, we wouldn't have had it come to this. Though there were also other issues with the with the employment that we discussed in my depositions. Everything was a result of his own actions. He wasn't some exemplary, stellar employee, especially as a result of what happened with that incident, and actually it was quite an embarrassment and bad for the county. We talked about the embarrassment stuff. So my question is in furtherance of this, he could have been warned or had some lesser form of discipline under the progressive discipline policy; correct? Can you ask this again, please? He could have been subject to progressive discipline under the progressive discipline policy; correct? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. | Mr. Cook made any efforts to mitigate his damages? I asked I spoke with our counsel to find out if there was anything responsive that would cause that would cause the response to be anything otherwise, and I was made aware of one interview, which, to me, sounds like not enough information for us to determine if he made a good faith effort. MS. MINAHAN: And, obviously, the answer to the amended complaint was filed months ago, so your question is locked in time to when that answer was filed. MS. GROEDEL: Okay. Well, I was not done asking if she reviewed anything to determine whether or not this is an accurate still an accurate affirmative defense. MS. MINAHAN: But the question is was it accurate when it was filed? MS. GROEDEL: It says right on here when it was filed. MS. MINAHAN: Correct. Ma'am, I'm asking if you reviewed any documents to | | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 Q 13 14 15 16 17 A 18 Q 19 20 21 A | all of this controversy came up surrounding surrounding the him hitting the person on the skateboard and the hit-skip and all of that, we wouldn't have had it come to this. Though there were also other issues with the with the employment that we discussed in my depositions. Everything was a result of his own actions. He wasn't some exemplary, stellar employee, especially as a result of what happened with that incident, and actually it was quite an embarrassment and bad for the county. We talked about the embarrassment stuff. So my question is in furtherance of this, he could have been warned or had some lesser form of discipline under the progressive discipline policy; correct? Can you ask this again, please? He could have been subject to progressive discipline under the progressive discipline policy; correct? No. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. | Mr. Cook made any efforts to mitigate his damages? I asked I spoke with our counsel to find out if there was anything responsive that would cause that would cause the response to be anything otherwise, and I was made aware of one interview, which, to me, sounds like not enough information for us to determine if he made a good faith effort. MS. MINAHAN: And, obviously, the answer to the amended complaint was filed months ago, so your question is locked in time to when that answer was filed. MS. GROEDEL: Okay. Well, I was not done asking if she reviewed anything to determine whether or not this is an accurate still an accurate affirmative defense. MS. MINAHAN: But the question is was it accurate when it was filed? MS. GROEDEL: It says right on here when it was filed. MS. MINAHAN: Correct. Ma'am, I'm asking if you reviewed any documents to determine whether or not whether it be any | | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 Q 13 14 15 16 17 A 18 Q 19 20 21 A | all of this controversy came up surrounding surrounding the him hitting the person on the skateboard and the hit-skip and all of that, we wouldn't have had it come to this. Though there were also other issues with the with the employment that we discussed in my depositions. Everything was a result of his own actions. He wasn't some exemplary, stellar employee, especially as a result of what happened with that incident, and actually it was quite an embarrassment and bad for the county. We talked about the embarrassment stuff. So my question is in furtherance of this, he could have been warned or had some lesser form of discipline under the progressive discipline policy; correct? Can you ask this again, please? He could have been subject to progressive discipline under the progressive discipline policy; correct? No. Could not have been? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. | Mr. Cook made any efforts to mitigate his damages? I asked I spoke with our counsel to find out if there was anything responsive that would cause that would cause the response to be anything otherwise, and I was made aware of one interview, which, to me, sounds like not enough information for us to determine if he made a good faith effort. MS. MINAHAN: And, obviously, the answer to the amended complaint was filed months ago, so your question is locked in time to when that answer was filed. MS. GROEDEL: Okay. Well, I was not done asking if she reviewed anything to determine whether or not this is an accurate still an accurate affirmative defense. MS. MINAHAN: But the question is was it accurate when it was filed? MS. GROEDEL: It says right on here when it was filed. MS. MINAHAN: Correct. Ma'am, I'm asking if you reviewed any documents to determine whether or not whether it be any deposition transcripts, any discovery responses, | | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 Q 13 14 15 16 17 A 18 Q 20 21 A 22 Q | all of this controversy came up surrounding surrounding the him hitting the person on the skateboard and the hit-skip and all of that, we wouldn't have had it come to this. Though there were also other issues with the with the employment that we discussed in my depositions. Everything was a result of his own actions. He wasn't some exemplary, stellar employee, especially as a result of what happened with that incident, and actually it was quite an embarrassment and bad for the county. We talked about the embarrassment stuff. So my question is in furtherance of this, he could have been warned or had some lesser form of discipline under the progressive discipline policy; correct? Can you ask this again, please? He could have been subject to progressive discipline under the progressive discipline policy; correct? No. Could not have been? No. He wasn't bound by the |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | Q. | Mr. Cook made any efforts to mitigate his damages? I asked I spoke with our counsel to find out if there was anything responsive that would cause that would cause the response to be anything otherwise, and I was made aware of one interview, which, to me, sounds like not enough information for us to determine if he made a good faith effort. MS. MINAHAN: And, obviously, the answer to the amended complaint was filed months ago, so your question is locked in time to when that answer was filed. MS. GROEDEL: Okay. Well, I was not done asking if she reviewed anything to determine whether or not this is an accurate still an accurate affirmative defense. MS. MINAHAN: But the question is was it accurate when it was filed? MS. GROEDEL: It says right on here when it was filed. MS. MINAHAN: Correct. Ma'am, I'm asking if you reviewed any documents to determine whether or not whether it be any deposition transcripts, any discovery responses, any document production, to determine whether | | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 A 18 20 21 A 22 A 22 A | all of this controversy came up surrounding surrounding the him hitting the person on the skateboard and the hit-skip and all of that, we wouldn't have had it come to this. Though there were also other issues with the with the employment that we discussed in my depositions. Everything was a result of his own actions. He wasn't some exemplary, stellar employee, especially as a result of what happened with that incident, and actually it was quite an embarrassment and bad for the county. We talked about the embarrassment stuff. So my question is in furtherance of this, he could have been warned or had some lesser form of discipline under the progressive discipline policy; correct? Can you ask this again, please? He could have been subject to progressive discipline under the progressive discipline policy; correct? No. Could not have been? No. He wasn't bound by the Please just answer my questions. I don't want to |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. | Mr. Cook made any efforts to mitigate his damages? I asked I spoke with our counsel to find out if there was anything responsive that would cause that would cause the response to be anything otherwise, and I was made aware of one interview, which, to me, sounds like not enough information for us to determine if he made a good faith effort. MS. MINAHAN: And, obviously, the answer to the amended complaint was filed months ago, so your question is locked in time to when that answer was filed. MS. GROEDEL: Okay. Well, I was not done asking if she reviewed anything to determine whether or not this is an accurate still an accurate affirmative defense. MS. MINAHAN: But the question is was it accurate when it was filed? MS. GROEDEL: It says right on here when it was filed. MS. MINAHAN: Correct. Ma'am, I'm asking if you reviewed any documents to determine whether or not whether it be any deposition transcripts, any discovery responses, | | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 Q 13 14 15 16 17 A 18 Q 20 21 A 22 Q | all of this controversy came up surrounding surrounding the him hitting the person on the skateboard and the hit-skip and all of that, we wouldn't have had it come to this. Though there were also other issues with the with the employment that we discussed in my depositions. Everything was a result of his own actions. He wasn't some exemplary, stellar employee, especially as a result of what happened with that incident, and actually it was quite an embarrassment and bad for the county. We talked about the embarrassment stuff. So my question is in furtherance of this, he could have been warned or had some lesser form of discipline under the progressive discipline policy; correct? Can you ask this again, please? He could have been subject to progressive discipline under the progressive discipline policy; correct? No. Could not have been? No. He wasn't bound by the |

| | | | 25 | | | | 27 |
|-------|----------|----------|---|-------|------------|----------|---|
| 03:07 | 1 | | You can just answer yes or no questions with yes or | 03:11 | 1 | Q. | When? |
| | 2 | | no, and if your attorney wants to follow up, she | | 2 | A. | Originally when we received it we were waiting to |
| | 3 | | will. | | 3 | | have counsel assigned, and that is what we were |
| | 4 | | Did the handbook preclude progressive | | 4 | | advised by Mr well, wait a second. I don't |
| | 5 | | discipline rather than termination? | | 5 | | think I can answer anything that's attorney/client |
| | 6 | Α. | The I don't have that in front of me to answer | | 6 | | privilege. |
| | 7 | | it. | | 7 | Q. | Well, facts are never privileged. Facts are facts. |
| | 8 | Q. | You don't know? | | 8 | _ | Okay. Well, the fact is I was waiting for counsel |
| | _ | | Yeah, I don't know. | | 9 | | to be assigned, as a member of the board of |
| 1 | 0 | Q. | | | 10 | | commissioners, that never happened. |
| | 1 | | What is the factual basis for that affirmative | | 11 | | I'm sorry, and it did happen, but it was not |
| | 2 | | defense? | | 12 | | perfected service, in my personal opinion, but, |
| | | Δ | I don't know. | | 13 | | then again, I'm not an attorney, so |
| | _ | Q. | | | 14 | Q. | Who did you speak to regarding this, and when? |
| | 5 | ۷. | Defense? | | 15 | Α. | |
| | | Α. | | | 16 | ۸. | when I reviewed what the back when I saw what |
| | 7 | Λ. | service there is insufficiency of service | | 17 | | she well, maybe I didn't talk to her, but I read |
| | 8 | | process. I know that there was a conversation with | | 18 | | it because I was already aware whenever she sent |
| | 9 | | you, like something that you sent to Bill Danso | | 19 | | the answers back and the defenses back. I read |
| | 20 | | saying thank you for whatever, but we never, as the | | 20 | | everything that the board that's sent out, all |
| | .u 21 | | board of commissioners, acknowledged or agreed that | | 20 21 | | of our answers and things like that, so and then |
| | 22 | | | | 22 | | • |
| | 23 | Q. | we would accept service in that way so | | 23 | | afterwards in preparation for this, when we were |
| | .3 24 | Q. | What documents, if any, did you review to conclude | | 23 24 | | going over our paperwork, this was actually this |
| | .4 25 | | that there was no agreement to accept service for | | 24 25 | | was actually something that I looked at and I'm |
| | .5 | | or on behalf of the board of commissioners? | | 25 | | SOFFY. |
| | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO |
| 00.00 | 4 | | 26 | 00:40 | 4 | ^ | Zasalla thistaida a casa sissala sucation |
| 03:09 | 1 | Α. | I didn't have to review any documents, ma'am. I | 03:12 | 1 | | I really think it's a very simple question. |
| | 2 | | was a member of the board that was being sued, and | | 2 | _ | Yes. |
| | | | there was no one there was no conversation to | | | _ | Who did you talk to about this? |
| | 4 | | accept the service in the way that you're saying | | 4 | Α. | When it happened, Bill Danso, and now when I was |
| | 5 6 | | that it was accepted. I wasn't there. | | 5 6 | | preparing, to Kathleen Minahan, and that's what I |
| | 7 | | I'll be honest, I didn't review anything | | 7 | ^ | said earlier. |
| | | | because I have recollection of the circumstances. | | 8 | Q. | Bill Danso, when it happened, and Kathleen |
| | 8 9 | | We didn't have counsel. I mean, it was not to | | 9 | A. | Yes. But I'm sorry, when we received service or |
| 4 | 9 | | my eyes, there was no agreement that we would | | 9 10 | | when we received I'm sorry, received service. |
| | 1 | | accept the service. But you somehow thought that | | 11 | | When we get when we find out about things, |
| | | Q. | it was based on what you sent to our office, so Do you know if any attorneys agreed to accept | | 12 | | our attorney I don't know if I'm allowed I guess in generalities, our attorney, Bill Danso, |
| | 3 | ⋖. | process for the commissioners? | | 13 | | will send something to the commissioners and tell |
| | | Α. | • | | 14 | | us generally that, you know, we are waiting for |
| | 5 | Λ. | prosecutor, neither did Bill Danso, so | | 15 | | CORSA to assign counsel, or that there is a |
| | | Q. | And where did you get that information from, that | | 16 | | conflict, or whatever it is. |
| | 7 | Œ. | neither attorney agreed to accept service of | | 17 | | So back then I was aware, and then again right |
| | 8 | | process? | | 1 <i>1</i> | | now, or within the last three weeks, it was |
| | | Α. | Because it wasn't waived, and if it were waived | | 19 | | |
| | 20 | Α. | then the board of commissioners would have been | | 20 | | discussed again, but this time the communication was with our counsel through CORSA, so |
| | 21 | | known or asked been notified or asked. | | 20 21 | Q. | <u> </u> |
| | | Q. | | | 21 22 | Q. A. | I'm going to try to ask it in a really concise way. |
| | | Q. A. | Did you speak with anyone regarding this? | | 23 | _ | Maybe start over again. |
| | | A. Q. | When? Either counsel? | | 23 24 | Q. | Well, I do, but you seem to have, out of all the |
| | | | | | 24 25 | | people I've deposed, are the most educated and the |
| | .5 | Α. | Yes. | | 25 | | most trouble understanding my questions. |
| 1 | | -c | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO |

| | | | 29 | | | | 31 |
|---------|----------|----------|---|-----------|----------|---------|---|
| 03:14 | 1 | | What documents did you review in preparation | 03:18 | 1 . | Α. | A portion of it. |
| | 2 | | for your deposition concerning the Tenth | | _ | Q. | |
| | 3 | | Affirmative Defense? | | 3 | | within the government of Trumbull County and |
| | 4 | A. | None. | | 4 | | amenable to sue under Ohio law. Do you see that? |
| | 5 | Q. | In preparation for your deposition with whom did | | 5 | Α. | Yes. |
| | 6 | | you speak, if anyone, concerning the Tenth Defense? | | 6 | Q. | And the answer was a denial. Do you see that? |
| | 7 | A. | | | 7 | Α. | Yes. |
| | 8 | Q. | And Miss Minahan told you the fact a fact that | | 8 | Q. | And what is the factual basis of that denial? |
| | 9 | | there has been no agreement to accept service of | | 9 | Α. | The board is not the governing body. |
| | 10 | | process by or on behalf of the commissioners? | 1 | 0 | Q. | Well, who was the lawsuit against? |
| | 11 | A. | She told what was the question? | 1 | 1 . | Α. | The board. |
| | 12 | | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Objection. | 1 | 2 | Q. | So in looking at who was sued, in paragraph 5 of |
| | 13 | | MS. GROEDEL: I'm not asking for | 1 | 3 | | the complaint of the amended complaint, is that |
| | 14 | | advice, Kathleen. This is a fact. Facts are | 1 | 4 | | still an accurate denial? |
| | 15 | | never, ever, ever, privileged. | 1 | 5 | Α. | The denial is correct. It is still denied. |
| | 16 | | MS. MINAHAN: I understand that, but | 1 | 6 | Q. | Okay. Are you saying that the board is not an |
| | 17 | | what you are asking about is the communication | 1 | 7 | | entity within the government? |
| | 18 | | from counsel to client. Whether there was | 1 | 8 | Α. | Which entity? We are the entity. There is no |
| | 19 | | service is an entirely different issue. How | 1 | 9 | | separate entity. We're not an entity within |
| | 20 | | she found out there was or was not service is a | 2 | 20 | | ourselves. |
| | 21 | | communication with counsel. | 2 | 21 | Q. | An entity within Trumbull County? |
| | 22 | | MS. GROEDEL: Are you instructing her | 2 | 22 | Α. | It says within the government of Trumbull County. |
| | 23 | | not to answer? I'll file over this, if you | 2 | 23 | Q. | Okay. And what is the factual basis for that being |
| | 24 | | want. I don't want to be argumentative. | 2 | 24 | | inaccurate? It's not part of the board of |
| | 25 | | MS. MINAHAN: Yes, I am. | 2 | 25 | | commissioners is not within the government of |
| | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO |
| | | | 30 | | | | 32 |
| 03:16 | 1 | | MS. GROEDEL: Okay. I'm going to make | 03:20 | 1 | | Trumbull County, it acts outside the government? |
| | 2 | | a last good faith effort for you to withdraw | | 2 | Α. | It is the government. We're not within the |
| | 3 | | your instruction for her not to answer. Are | | 3 | | government. |
| | 4 | | you declining? | | 4 | Q. | So you are not a part of the Trumbull government, |
| | 5 | | MS. MINAHAN: Yeah. I think I just | | 5 | | you are the government? |
| | 6 | | said that, yes. | | | Α. | We're not an entity. We are not an entity within |
| | 7 | | MS. GROEDEL: Well, I am obligated to | | 7 | | Trumbull County government. We are Trumbull County |
| | 8 | | do that before I file a motion, so I wanted to | | 8 | | government. We are a political subdivision. It's |
| | 9 | | make sure. | | 9 | | a statutory county. We are a county. We are |
| | 10 | Q. | Okay. I just want to make sure you didn't | | 0 | | Trumbull County government. We're not an entity |
| | 11 | | strike that. | | 1 | | within it. We're not a board. We are not a |
| | 12 | | Let's look at the next category, which is 5, no | | 2 | _ | department. We are Trumbull County. |
| | 13 | _ | 4. No, we did 4 5. | | | Q. | As a subdivision of a government, meaning Trumbull |
| | 14 | Α. | • | | 4 | _ | County? |
| | 15 | Q. | , | | | Α. | No, ma'am. No ma'am. You're confused. |
| | 16 | Α. | • | | _ | Q. | You just said |
| | 17 40 | Q. | Yeah. Oh, denial, sorry, no, we didn't. | | | A. | No, ma'am. We're not a subdivision within Trumbull |
| | 18 40 | | 4, first we'll do the denials and then we'll do | | 8 | ^ | County. We are Trumbull County. |
| | 19 20 | | the insufficient information. | | | | The board is Trumbull County? |
| | 20 | | So if you could look at paragraph 5 of the | | | A. ^ | |
| | 21 22 | | complaint? | | | Q. ^ | Is the county? |
| | 22 23 | Α. | | | | A. ∩ | That's who the lawsuit was filed against. |
| | 23 24 | Q. A. | Do you see the complaint? | | 23 24 | Q. | , |
| | 24 25 | | Yes. Okay. | | .4 25 | | What is the factual basis for the denial that |
| | 20 | u. | • | | | | plaintiff filed with the State Employment Relations |
| 05/12/2 | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | - 22 -f 0 | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO |

| | | | 33 | | | 35 |
|-------|----|----|---|----------------|----|---|
| 03:22 | 1 | | Board? | 03:26 1 | | votes present, physically present? |
| | 2 | A. | He did not file with the State Employment Relations | 2 | A. | Your question is not making sense. We don't vote |
| | 3 | | Board. | 3 | | in executive session, so could you clarify your |
| | 4 | Q. | And what documents did you review, or who did you | 4 | | question? |
| | 5 | | speak to in connection with that response? | 5 | Q. | Does the Ohio Revised Code, or any documents within |
| | 6 | A. | I recall. I was there. I did not speak to anyone | 6 | | Trumbull County, or of the board of commissioners, |
| | 7 | | in preparations for this response in this hearing | 7 | | require physical presence for a termination or |
| | 8 | | right now. I was there when all of this happened. | 8 | | other adverse employment action to be decided upon |
| | 9 | Q. | Okay. Let's look at 14. | 9 | | by the commissioners? |
| | 10 | A. | Do you know the difference between SERB and SPBR? | 10 | A. | Not at that time. |
| | 11 | Q. | Ma'am, I'm on Number 14. | 11 | | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. |
| | 12 | A. | I just thought I would try to help you. | 12 | A. | Objection she made an objection while I was |
| | 13 | Q. | Thanks. | 13 | | answering. |
| | 14 | | In looking at Number 14 | 14 | | MS. MINAHAN: That's okay. Go ahead |
| | 15 | A. | Yes. | 15 | | and answer. |
| | 16 | Q. | did you have any social media that discussed | 16 | | Objection. |
| | 17 | | getting rid of the "Good Old Boys"? | 17 | | Go ahead and answer. |
| | 18 | A. | Yes. | 18 | A. | Okay. Not at that time. There was legislation |
| | 19 | Q. | You did include that on some social one or more | 19 | | enacted by the state during COVID which allowed for |
| | 20 | | social media posts; correct? | 20 | | boards to function regularly with virtual presence. |
| | 21 | A. | Yes. | 21 | | There was no requirement at the time of this |
| | 22 | Q. | Okay. And Number 15, do you know so this was | 22 | | decision to have all commissioners present pursuant |
| | 23 | | denied; correct? It says that in January of 2021 | 23 | | to the legislation that was enacted at that time |
| | 24 | | during the second board meeting that you attended, | 24 | | due to COVID. |
| | 25 | | you and another commissioner went into executive | 25 | Q. | Did was one commissioner either at a doctor's |
| | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO |
| | | | 34 | | | 36 |
| 03:24 | 1 | | session where you decided where they decided, | 03:28 1 | | office or in a car coming to or from a doctor's |
| | 2 | | you and he, in bad faith, to terminate plaintiff's | 2 | | office when he voted on Mr. Cook's termination? |
| | 3 | | employment. Do you see that? | 3 | A. | I don't know. |
| | 4 | A. | Yes. | 4 | Q. | Was he on any medication at the time, to your |
| | 5 | Q. | And my question is, I know one of the members who | 5 | | knowledge? |
| | 6 | | voted was not in the meeting; correct? | 6 | A. | I don't know. |
| | 7 | A. | That's not correct. | 7 | Q. | Okay. Let's look at Number |
| | 8 | Q. | When the decision was made were all three | 8 | | THE WITNESS: Can I take a two-minute |
| | 9 | | commissioners present in person at the meeting when | 9 | | break to use the restroom? |
| | 10 | | the decision was made? | 10 | | MS. GROEDEL: We'll take a five-minute |
| | 11 | A. | You will have to break that question down. You | 11 | | break, and I will go to the restroom, too. |
| | 12 | | asked two different things. | 12 | | MS. MINAHAN: Okay. Five minutes. |
| | 13 | Q. | Okay. I'll break it down. | 13 | | Thanks. |
| | 14 | | Were all three commissioners in the same | 14 | | |
| | 15 | | location when the decision was made? | 15 | | (Whereupon, a recess was had.) |
| | 16 | A. | This is not being asked in a fashion that I feel | 16 | | |
| | 17 | | that I can answer and give an honest response. | 17 | Q. | Who is the interim 911 director? |
| | 18 | Q. | Well, it's very simple: Were all three | 18 | A. | Patty Goldner. |
| | 19 | | commissioners physically in the same location, | 19 | | Which number are we on? |
| | 20 | | physically? | 20 | Q. | I'm on replacement, 18, paragraph 18. |
| | 21 | A. | There you go. Now you asked it. | 21 | A. | So what are you asking me? |
| | 22 | | No. | 22 | Q. | She is the interim replacement for him, correct, |
| | 23 | Q. | And do you know whether the Ohio Revised Code or | 23 | | Miss Goldner? |
| | 24 | | any legislation or document requires decisions to | 24 | | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. |
| | 25 | | be made in executive session with all required | 25 | | Go ahead and answer. |
| | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | o 36 of 93 | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO |

| | | | 37 | | | | 39 |
|-------|----------|----------|--|------------|-----------|------------|---|
| 03:37 | 1 | A. | You are asking if this is not | 03:40 | 1 | | questions. |
| | 2 | Q. | 18, paragraph 18, is the interim replacement Patty | | 2 (| Չ. | Does she have less education than Mr. Cook? |
| | 3 | | Goldner? | | 3 A | ١. | I don't know. |
| | 4 | | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. | | 4 0 | 2. | Did you talk to anyone or look at any documents to |
| | 5 | | Go ahead. | | 5 | | find out whether that statement is true or not? |
| | 6 | A. | No. | | 6 A | ١. | It was denied based on the fact that he wasn't |
| | 7 | Q. | Who took over who took over his job | | 7 | | replaced, so now you're asking things I didn't |
| | 8 | | responsibilities after Mr. Cook was terminated? | | 8 | | necessarily prepare for today because the basis for |
| | 9 | A. | After he was terminated, there is an interim who | | 9 | | the denial is that he hasn't even been replaced. |
| | 10 | | there was an interim who picked up his | 1 | 0 0 | 2. | Well, it doesn't say whether it's a temporary or |
| | 11 | | responsibilities while doing her own job, and he | 1 | 1 | | permanent replacement, does it, ma'am? |
| | 12 | | was not replaced yet. | 1 | 2 | | MS. MINAHAN: I didn't hear what you |
| | 13 | Q. | Who? | 1 | 3 | | said. Can you repeat that, please? |
| | 14 | A. | Mr. Cook has not been replaced yet. | 1 | 4 (| Q . | I said this paragraph doesn't say whether the |
| | 15 | Q. | Who is the interim? | 1 | 5 | | replacement is temporary or permanent, does it? |
| | 16 | A. | The interim is Patty Goldner | 1 | 6 | | MS. MINAHAN: Okay. Objection. |
| | 17 | Q. | Okay. | 1 | 7 | | Go ahead. |
| 1 | 18 | A. | who assumed those additional duties. | 1 | 8 A | ١. | No. Your statement doesn't clarify that. |
| 1 | 19 | Q. | And she's approximately 30 years younger than | 1 | 9 (| 2. | Right. Yet it was denied; correct? |
| | 20 | | plaintiff? | 2 | 20 A | ١. | It was denied. |
| | 21 | A. | I don't know. I know that she's in her forties. I | 2 | 21 (| 2. | Okay. Does Miss Goldner have less education than |
| | 22 | | think she's | 2 | 22 | | Mr. Cook? Simple question, yes, no, or I don't |
| | 23 | Q. | You don't know? | 2 | 23 | | know. |
| | 24 | A. | Yeah. I'm not certain of the age difference. | 2 | 24 A | ١. | I don't know. |
| | 25 | Q. | Did you talk to anyone about this, or look at any | 2 | 25 C | 2. | You don't know? I didn't hear you? |
| | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO |
| | | | 38 | | | | 40 |
| 03:39 | 1 | | documents in preparation for your deposition in | 03:42 | 1 A | ١. | I said I don't know. |
| | 2 | | which you would be asked this question? | | | 2. | Did you talk to anyone or look at any documents to |
| | 3 | A. | You know, for this one, as far as it goes as it | | 3 | | find out whether that is an accurate statement? |
| | 4 | | relates to the age, no, I didn't. I just know that | | 4 4 | ١. | At the time when these defenses and these responses |
| | 5 | _ | she is close to my age, so | | 5 | | occurred I was instrumental in preparing the |
| | 6 | Q. | If you could just answer yes, or no, or I don't | | 6 | | responses. So, back then, yes, but for today, I |
| | 7 | | know when I ask yes or no questions. | | 7 | _ | did not go over that. |
| | 8 | | MS. GROEDEL: Because, Kathleen, I'll | | | 2. | So you don't know then, and you didn't know now? |
| | 9 | | tell you, at this rate there is no way we're | | | ١. | I did know then, but I didn't reacquaint myself |
| | 10 | | going to be done by 4:30. I'm just letting you | | 0 | | with anything for this question today. |
| | 11 | _ | know. | | | 2. | But this was denied in full including the part |
| | 12 | Q. | I'll ask you again, did you talk to anyone to | | 2 | | about the education; correct? |
| | 13 | | determine whether or not the statement in paragraph | | | ١. | Oh, yes. Uh-huh. |
| | 14 45 | | 18 of the amended complaint is accurate that the | | 4 | | She has been there is an equivalency that |
| | 15 16 | | person who was replacing him, even if temporarily, | | 5 | | relates to your experience being considered as your |
| | 16 17 | | is at least 30 years younger than he? | | 6 | | education, and I believe she's been working there |
| | 17 18 | A. Q. | In preparation for this right now, no. | | 7 8 G | ` | since her whole life, adult life. |
| | 19 | Q. | In preparation for this, whenever you prepared for | | 9 | 2. | Answer the question, ma'am. I'm not talking |
| | 20 | | it? Did you talk to anyone or look at any | | 20 | | experience and I am not talking equivalency. I am |
| | 20 21 | | documents, ma'am, to know whether or not that was | | | | talking about education. |
| | 21 22 | | an accurate statement that she is approximately 30 | | | ۹. 2. | Okay. When this was denied, you said you were |
| | 23 | A. | years younger? When we responded to the original complaint I | | 23 | ٠. | instrumental in answering this. In answering this |
| | 23 24 | Λ. | reviewed it. I don't remember specifically right | | .3 24 | | in its entirety, including all of its components, |
| | | | | 1 * | | | in its characty, including all of its components, |
| | 25 | | now, though, because I didn't review it for today's | 1 | 25 | | did you check to see whether Mr. Cook had more |
| | 25 | | now, though, because I didn't review it for today's MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | 2 | 25 | | did you check to see whether Mr. Cook had more MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO |

| | | | 41 | | | | 43 |
|-------|--------|----|---|-------|-----------|----|---|
| 03:43 | 1 | | education than Miss Goldner? | 03:47 | 1 | A. | That's not |
| | 2 | | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. | | 2 | Q. | Are we not looking at the same thing? Okay. Then |
| | 3 | | Go ahead. | | 3 | | I need to get the one that was hold on. |
| | 4 | A. | I can't remember. | | 4 | A. | No. That's Number 21 on mine. For the entire 15 |
| | 5 | Q. | And you didn't check in preparation for this | | 5 | | years of his employment with Trumbull County |
| | 6 | | deposition; correct? | | 6 | | plaintiff had a stellar work and attendance record. |
| | 7 | A. | No. | | 7 | | That's Number 21 that I'm looking at. |
| | 8 | Q. | I'm not correct, or I am correct? | | 8 | | MS. MINAHAN: Did I miss it? Is there |
| | 9 | A. | Why don't you ask your questions one time the way | | 9 | | a question pending? |
| | 10 | | you want it to be answered, and that will make it | | 10 | | MS. GROEDEL: No, I'm looking for the |
| | 11 | | easier and more efficient. So just a suggestion. | | 11 | | one that was filed, that has the document so |
| | 12 | | So do you want to ask that again exactly how | | 12 | | we're all looking at the same thing. |
| | 13 | | you want me to answer it? | | 13 | | MS. MINAHAN: Okay. |
| | 14 | Q. | In preparation for this deposition did you check on | | 14 | | MS. GROEDEL: I'll have Christina mark |
| | 15 | | how much education Miss Goldner has? I don't know | | 15 | | it and she will send it around in a minute. |
| | 16 | | any other way to ask the question. | | 16 | Q. | Let's go on to so 20 the amended complaint. |
| | 17 | A. | No. | | 17 | | Hold on one minute, I'm trying to see where she |
| | 18 | | MS. MINAHAN: Object. Objection. | | 18 | | saved it. |
| | 19 | | Go ahead and answer. | | 19 | | Okay. So sorry about that. |
| | 20 | A. | No. | | 20 | | Going back to paragraph so 21, "Had |
| | 21 | Q. | Paragraph 19 says: "Defendant failed to pay | | 21 | | plaintiff had any prior counseling or discipline |
| | 22 | | plaintiff 12 weeks' severance pay to which he is | | 22 | | prior to his termination?" |
| | 23 | | entitled." | | 23 | | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. |
| | 24 | | Now I know that you are going to say he wasn't | | 24 | | Go ahead. |
| | 25 | | entitled, but my question is was he paid any | | 25 | A. | There were complaints |
| | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO |
| | | | 42 | | _ | _ | 44 |
| 03:45 | 1 | | severance, Mr. Cook? | 03:52 | 1 | | Counseling or discipline, ma'am, please. |
| | 2 | Α. | No. | | 2 | A. | Oh, counseling or discipline? There were concerns, |
| | 3 | Q. | In looking at paragraph 20, had Mr. Cook, prior to | | 3 | _ | but there were no counselings or disciplines. |
| | 4 | | his termination, ever been subject to counseling or | | 4 | | And did he have any attendance issues? |
| | 5 | ^ | discipline? | | 5 | | Yes. |
| | 6 | Α. | I'm looking at 20. You just said in looking at 20. | | 6 | Q. | Is there anything noted in his personnel file about |
| | 7 8 | | Are you looking at something other than 20? | | 7 8 | ۸ | attendance issues? No. |
| | 9 | | MS. MINAHAN: Caryn, are these renumbered? | | 9 | Α. | |
| | 10 | | MS. GROEDEL: No. | | 10 | | The county hasn't been keeping track of that. They just started implementing a time clock that |
| | 11 | | MS. MINAHAN: Because if they've been | | 11 | | was required since I got there. |
| | 12 | | renumbered | | 12 | | So prior to that, that's one of the reasons |
| | 13 | | MS. GROEDEL: No. This is shown on | | 13 | | that led up to us implementing a time clock is |
| | 14 | | the top as is this the one that is shown on | | 14 | | because of the problems at 911, so |
| | 15 | | the top? Oh, maybe this is not the one. Hold | | 15 | Q. | Can you answer my question? |
| | 16 | | on. | | 16 | - | Yeah. I did. |
| | 17 | A. | Number 20 that I'm looking at says that defendants | | . o 17 | Q. | No, you didn't. You went on and on about how there |
| | 18 | | failed to pay plaintiff 12 weeks' severance pay to | | 18 | ٦. | was no policy or there was no clock or whatever. |
| | 19 | | which he was entitled, and then the answer was | | 19 | | My question is very simple. Try to follow. |
| | 20 | | denied because it's not a benefit that Trumbull | | 20 | A. | I already answered it. If you want to ask this |
| | 21 | | County offers. | | 21 | | lady here to read what I wrote she will read you |
| | 22 | Q. | • | | 22 | | what I said. I'm sorry. |
| | 23 | A. | This is 20. | | 23 | Q. | Thank you. I'm leading the deposition. I want a |
| | 24 | Q. | It says, "For the 15 years of his employment," | | 24 | | clear record. |
| 1 | 25 | | blah-blah-blah. | | 25 | | Is there anything in Mr. Cook's personnel file |
| | 25 | | Sidir Sidir Sidiri | | | | , , |

| | | 45 | | | 47 |
|--|----------------|--|--|----------------------|---|
| 03:54 1 | | referencing any attendance issues whatsoever? | 1 | | |
| 2 | A. | Nothing documented, no. | 2 | | (Plaintiff's Exhibit 3 was marked for purposes of |
| 3 | Q. | Thank you. Thank you. | 3 | | identification.) |
| 4 | | Look at paragraph well, let me ask this: At | 4 | | |
| 5 | | the time of his termination did Mr. Cook meet all | 5 | | MS. MINAHAN: No. It's a new one. |
| 6 | | of the requirements in terms of education, | 6 | | I'm forwarding it right now to you, |
| 7 | | experience and other qualifications to be the 911 | 7 | | Commissioner Frenchko. |
| 8 | | director? | 8 | A. | I have received it and I am opening it right now. |
| 9 | | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. I don't know | 9 | Q. | So you have opened up both the amended complaint |
| 10 | | that this relates to a topic, but go ahead and | 10 | | and the commissioner's answer; correct? |
| 11 | | answer. | 11 | A. | Yes. The notice of the electronic filing, and the |
| 12 | | MS. GROEDEL: It does. | 12 | | amended complaint. |
| 13 | Α. | Which one? I'm trying to follow along. | 13 | Q. | All right. Good. |
| 14 | Q. | It's okay. You can just answer my question. | 14 | | So we were on paragraph section 5 of the |
| 15 | | Did he meet all the minimum qualifications for | 15 | | amended of the deposition notice. So now we're |
| 16 | | the job at the time of his termination? | 16 | | going to look at the denial in paragraph |
| 17 | A. | No. | 17 | | paragraph 12 of the answer to the amended |
| 18 | | Wait you have to be able to pass a | 18 | | complaint. |
| 19 | | background check, and he wouldn't have passed a | 19 | | What is the lack of knowledge or information |
| 20 | | background check. | 20 | | that the commission did not have enough information |
| 21 | Q. | At the time of his termination did he meet the | 21 | | to answer with respect to paragraph 12 of the |
| 22 | | minimum stated qualifications? | 22 | | amended complaint? |
| 23 | A. | Yes | 23 | A. | · |
| 24 | Q. | Let's look at Number 5, Section 5 of the deposition | 24 | | something different, which is just a section that |
| 25 | | notice. Okay. Section 5 is talking about the | 25 | | was pulled out. |
| | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO |
| | | 46 | | | 48 |
| | | | | | |
| 1 | | averments and answers to the amended complaint that | 04:11 1 | | Can you read it? I'm looking at something |
| 2 | | averments and answers to the amended complaint that the commissioners had the board had insufficient | 04:11 1 2 | | Can you read it? I'm looking at something different. Paragraph 12? |
| | | · · | _ | Q. | |
| 2 | | the commissioners had the board had insufficient | 2 | | different. Paragraph 12? |
| 2 | | the commissioners had the board had insufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the | 2 3 | | different. Paragraph 12? I just sent it to you, and so did Kathleen. |
| 2 3 4 | | the commissioners had the board had insufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the averments in those paragraphs. So let's take them | 2 3 4 | A. | different. Paragraph 12? I just sent it to you, and so did Kathleen. Paragraph 12? So we skipped through 5; right? You |
| 2 3 4 5 | | the commissioners had the board had insufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the averments in those paragraphs. So let's take them in order. | 2 3 4 5 | A. Q. | different. Paragraph 12? I just sent it to you, and so did Kathleen. Paragraph 12? So we skipped through 5; right? You don't want to ask anything else from 5? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | | the commissioners had the board had insufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the averments in those paragraphs. So let's take them in order. Okay. In looking at paragraph 2 okay. | 2 3 4 5 6 | A. Q. A. | different. Paragraph 12? I just sent it to you, and so did Kathleen. Paragraph 12? So we skipped through 5; right? You don't want to ask anything else from 5? I am on section 5, ma'am. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | | the commissioners had the board had insufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the averments in those paragraphs. So let's take them in order. Okay. In looking at paragraph 2 okay. Paragraph 2 I'm sorry, looking at 3, what are | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | A. Q. A. | different. Paragraph 12? I just sent it to you, and so did Kathleen. Paragraph 12? So we skipped through 5; right? You don't want to ask anything else from 5? I am on section 5, ma'am. Can you read me what it says then? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | | the commissioners had the board had insufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the averments in those paragraphs. So let's take them in order. Okay. In looking at paragraph 2 okay. Paragraph 2 I'm sorry, looking at 3, what are the allegations that in paragraph 3 of the | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | A. Q. A. | different. Paragraph 12? I just sent it to you, and so did Kathleen. Paragraph 12? So we skipped through 5; right? You don't want to ask anything else from 5? I am on section 5, ma'am. Can you read me what it says then? "In 2010 the Board of Trumbull County Commissioners |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | the commissioners had the board had insufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the averments in those paragraphs. So let's take them in order. Okay. In looking at paragraph 2 okay. Paragraph 2 I'm sorry, looking at 3, what are the allegations that in paragraph 3 of the amended complaint that the board did not have | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A. Q. A. | different. Paragraph 12? I just sent it to you, and so did Kathleen. Paragraph 12? So we skipped through 5; right? You don't want to ask anything else from 5? I am on section 5, ma'am. Can you read me what it says then? "In 2010 the Board of Trumbull County Commissioners assigned plaintiff the additional duty of directing |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | the commissioners had the board had insufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the averments in those paragraphs. So let's take them in order. Okay. In looking at paragraph 2 okay. Paragraph 2 I'm sorry, looking at 3, what are the allegations that in paragraph 3 of the amended complaint that the board did not have sufficient information to answer? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A. Q. A. Q. | different. Paragraph 12? I just sent it to you, and so did Kathleen. Paragraph 12? So we skipped through 5; right? You don't want to ask anything else from 5? I am on section 5, ma'am. Can you read me what it says then? "In 2010 the Board of Trumbull County Commissioners assigned plaintiff the additional duty of directing Trumbull County's 911 line." |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | | the commissioners had the board had insufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the averments in those paragraphs. So let's take them in order. Okay. In looking at paragraph 2 okay. Paragraph 2 I'm sorry, looking at 3, what are the allegations that in paragraph 3 of the amended complaint that the board did not have sufficient information to answer? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Calling for a legal conclusion. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | A. Q. A. Q. | different. Paragraph 12? I just sent it to you, and so did Kathleen. Paragraph 12? So we skipped through 5; right? You don't want to ask anything else from 5? I am on section 5, ma'am. Can you read me what it says then? "In 2010 the Board of Trumbull County Commissioners assigned plaintiff the additional duty of directing Trumbull County's 911 line." Okay. We're on the same page. Thank you for that. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | Q. | the commissioners had the board had insufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the averments in those paragraphs. So let's take them in order. Okay. In looking at paragraph 2 okay. Paragraph 2 I'm sorry, looking at 3, what are the allegations that in paragraph 3 of the amended complaint that the board did not have sufficient information to answer? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Calling for a legal conclusion. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | A. Q. A. Q. | different. Paragraph 12? I just sent it to you, and so did Kathleen. Paragraph 12? So we skipped through 5; right? You don't want to ask anything else from 5? I am on section 5, ma'am. Can you read me what it says then? "In 2010 the Board of Trumbull County Commissioners assigned plaintiff the additional duty of directing Trumbull County's 911 line." Okay. We're on the same page. Thank you for that. You're welcome. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Q. A. | the commissioners had the board had insufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the averments in those paragraphs. So let's take them in order. Okay. In looking at paragraph 2 okay. Paragraph 2 I'm sorry, looking at 3, what are the allegations that in paragraph 3 of the amended complaint that the board did not have sufficient information to answer? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Calling for a legal conclusion. Ms. Frenchko? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | A. Q. A. Q. | different. Paragraph 12? I just sent it to you, and so did Kathleen. Paragraph 12? So we skipped through 5; right? You don't want to ask anything else from 5? I am on section 5, ma'am. Can you read me what it says then? "In 2010 the Board of Trumbull County Commissioners assigned plaintiff the additional duty of directing Trumbull County's 911 line." Okay. We're on the same page. Thank you for that. You're welcome. And then if you look at the answer to that |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. A. Q. | the commissioners had the board had insufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the averments in those paragraphs. So let's take them in order. Okay. In looking at paragraph 2 okay. Paragraph 2 I'm sorry, looking at 3, what are the allegations that in paragraph 3 of the amended complaint that the board did not have sufficient information to answer? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Calling for a legal conclusion. Ms. Frenchko? I don't I don't know. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | A. Q. A. Q. | different. Paragraph 12? I just sent it to you, and so did Kathleen. Paragraph 12? So we skipped through 5; right? You don't want to ask anything else from 5? I am on section 5, ma'am. Can you read me what it says then? "In 2010 the Board of Trumbull County Commissioners assigned plaintiff the additional duty of directing Trumbull County's 911 line." Okay. We're on the same page. Thank you for that. You're welcome. And then if you look at the answer to that paragraph, the ending of it says, "Defendant denies |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q. A. Q. | the commissioners had the board had insufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the averments in those paragraphs. So let's take them in order. Okay. In looking at paragraph 2 okay. Paragraph 2 I'm sorry, looking at 3, what are the allegations that in paragraph 3 of the amended complaint that the board did not have sufficient information to answer? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Calling for a legal conclusion. Ms. Frenchko? I don't I don't know. Okay. Were the allegations in paragraph 6 of the | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | A. Q. A. Q. | I just sent it to you, and so did Kathleen. Paragraph 12? So we skipped through 5; right? You don't want to ask anything else from 5? I am on section 5, ma'am. Can you read me what it says then? "In 2010 the Board of Trumbull County Commissioners assigned plaintiff the additional duty of directing Trumbull County's 911 line." Okay. We're on the same page. Thank you for that. You're welcome. And then if you look at the answer to that paragraph, the ending of it says, "Defendant denies all remaining allegations for lack of knowledge or |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. A. Q. | the commissioners had the board had insufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the averments in those paragraphs. So let's take them in order. Okay. In looking at paragraph 2 okay. Paragraph 2 I'm sorry, looking at 3, what are the allegations that in paragraph 3 of the amended complaint that the board did not have sufficient information to answer? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Calling for a legal conclusion. Ms. Frenchko? I don't I don't know. Okay. Were the allegations in paragraph 6 of the amended complaint that the board had insufficient | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | A. Q. A. Q. | different. Paragraph 12? I just sent it to you, and so did Kathleen. Paragraph 12? So we skipped through 5; right? You don't want to ask anything else from 5? I am on section 5, ma'am. Can you read me what it says then? "In 2010 the Board of Trumbull County Commissioners assigned plaintiff the additional duty of directing Trumbull County's 911 line." Okay. We're on the same page. Thank you for that. You're welcome. And then if you look at the answer to that paragraph, the ending of it says, "Defendant denies all remaining allegations for lack of knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to their |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. A. Q. | the commissioners had the board had insufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the averments in those paragraphs. So let's take them in order. Okay. In looking at paragraph 2 okay. Paragraph 2 I'm sorry, looking at 3, what are the allegations that in paragraph 3 of the amended complaint that the board did not have sufficient information to answer? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Calling for a legal conclusion. Ms. Frenchko? I don't I don't know. Okay. Were the allegations in paragraph 6 of the amended complaint that the board had insufficient no. Let's see. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | A. Q. Q. | different. Paragraph 12? I just sent it to you, and so did Kathleen. Paragraph 12? So we skipped through 5; right? You don't want to ask anything else from 5? I am on section 5, ma'am. Can you read me what it says then? "In 2010 the Board of Trumbull County Commissioners assigned plaintiff the additional duty of directing Trumbull County's 911 line." Okay. We're on the same page. Thank you for that. You're welcome. And then if you look at the answer to that paragraph, the ending of it says, "Defendant denies all remaining allegations for lack of knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to their truth." |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. A. Q. | the commissioners had the board had insufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the averments in those paragraphs. So let's take them in order. Okay. In looking at paragraph 2 okay. Paragraph 2 I'm sorry, looking at 3, what are the allegations that in paragraph 3 of the amended complaint that the board did not have sufficient information to answer? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Calling for a legal conclusion. Ms. Frenchko? I don't I don't know. Okay. Were the allegations in paragraph 6 of the amended complaint that the board had insufficient no. Let's see. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | A. Q. Q. | I just sent it to you, and so did Kathleen. Paragraph 12? So we skipped through 5; right? You don't want to ask anything else from 5? I am on section 5, ma'am. Can you read me what it says then? "In 2010 the Board of Trumbull County Commissioners assigned plaintiff the additional duty of directing Trumbull County's 911 line." Okay. We're on the same page. Thank you for that. You're welcome. And then if you look at the answer to that paragraph, the ending of it says, "Defendant denies all remaining allegations for lack of knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to their truth." What was your lack of information regarding? |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. A. Q. | the commissioners had the board had insufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the averments in those paragraphs. So let's take them in order. Okay. In looking at paragraph 2 okay. Paragraph 2 I'm sorry, looking at 3, what are the allegations that in paragraph 3 of the amended complaint that the board did not have sufficient information to answer? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Calling for a legal conclusion. Ms. Frenchko? I don't I don't know. Okay. Were the allegations in paragraph 6 of the amended complaint that the board had insufficient no. Let's see. Okay, sorry. Paragraph 7, the denial | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A. Q. Q. | different. Paragraph 12? I just sent it to you, and so did Kathleen. Paragraph 12? So we skipped through 5; right? You don't want to ask anything else from 5? I am on section 5, ma'am. Can you read me what it says then? "In 2010 the Board of Trumbull County Commissioners assigned plaintiff the additional duty of directing Trumbull County's 911 line." Okay. We're on the same page. Thank you for that. You're welcome. And then if you look at the answer to that paragraph, the ending of it says, "Defendant denies all remaining allegations for lack of knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to their truth." What was your lack of information regarding? Well, what I have right now is the journal action |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. A. Q. | the commissioners had the board had insufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the averments in those paragraphs. So let's take them in order. Okay. In looking at paragraph 2 okay. Paragraph 2 I'm sorry, looking at 3, what are the allegations that in paragraph 3 of the amended complaint that the board did not have sufficient information to answer? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Calling for a legal conclusion. Ms. Frenchko? I don't I don't know. Okay. Were the allegations in paragraph 6 of the amended complaint that the board had insufficient no. Let's see. Okay, sorry. Paragraph 7, the denial (Off the record due to technical) | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | A. Q. Q. | different. Paragraph 12? I just sent it to you, and so did Kathleen. Paragraph 12? So we skipped through 5; right? You don't want to ask anything else from 5? I am on section 5, ma'am. Can you read me what it says then? "In 2010 the Board of Trumbull County Commissioners assigned plaintiff the additional duty of directing Trumbull County's 911 line." Okay. We're on the same page. Thank you for that. You're welcome. And then if you look at the answer to that paragraph, the ending of it says, "Defendant denies all remaining allegations for lack of knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to their truth." What was your lack of information regarding? Well, what I have right now is the journal action that shows that he was appointed by the board |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. A. Q. | the commissioners had the board had insufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the averments in those paragraphs. So let's take them in order. Okay. In looking at paragraph 2 okay. Paragraph 2 I'm sorry, looking at 3, what are the allegations that in paragraph 3 of the amended complaint that the board did not have sufficient information to answer? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Calling for a legal conclusion. Ms. Frenchko? I don't I don't know. Okay. Were the allegations in paragraph 6 of the amended complaint that the board had insufficient no. Let's see. Okay, sorry. Paragraph 7, the denial (Off the record due to technical) | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A. Q. Q. | different. Paragraph 12? I just sent it to you, and so did Kathleen. Paragraph 12? So we skipped through 5; right? You don't want to ask anything else from 5? I am on section 5, ma'am. Can you read me what it says then? "In 2010 the Board of Trumbull County Commissioners assigned plaintiff the additional duty of directing Trumbull County's 911 line." Okay. We're on the same page. Thank you for that. You're welcome. And then if you look at the answer to that paragraph, the ending of it says, "Defendant denies all remaining allegations for lack of knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to their truth." What was your lack of information regarding? Well, what I have right now is the journal action that shows that he was appointed by the board journalized to the position of 911 director on |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | Q. Q. Q. | the commissioners had the board had insufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the averments in those paragraphs. So let's take them in order. Okay. In looking at paragraph 2 okay. Paragraph 2 I'm sorry, looking at 3, what are the allegations that in paragraph 3 of the amended complaint that the board did not have sufficient information to answer? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Calling for a legal conclusion. Ms. Frenchko? I don't I don't know. Okay. Were the allegations in paragraph 6 of the amended complaint that the board had insufficient no. Let's see. Okay, sorry. Paragraph 7, the denial (Off the record due to technical difficulties.) | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | A. Q. Q. | different. Paragraph 12? I just sent it to you, and so did Kathleen. Paragraph 12? So we skipped through 5; right? You don't want to ask anything else from 5? I am on section 5, ma'am. Can you read me what it says then? "In 2010 the Board of Trumbull County Commissioners assigned plaintiff the additional duty of directing Trumbull County's 911 line." Okay. We're on the same page. Thank you for that. You're welcome. And then if you look at the answer to that paragraph, the ending of it says, "Defendant denies all remaining allegations for lack of knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to their truth." What was your lack of information regarding? Well, what I have right now is the journal action that shows that he was appointed by the board journalized to the position of 911 director on 10/20 of 2010. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. Q. Q. | the commissioners had the board had insufficient knowledge to form a belief as to the truth of the averments in those paragraphs. So let's take them in order. Okay. In looking at paragraph 2 okay. Paragraph 2 I'm sorry, looking at 3, what are the allegations that in paragraph 3 of the amended complaint that the board did not have sufficient information to answer? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Calling for a legal conclusion. Ms. Frenchko? I don't I don't know. Okay. Were the allegations in paragraph 6 of the amended complaint that the board had insufficient no. Let's see. Okay, sorry. Paragraph 7, the denial (Off the record due to technical difficulties.) | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A. Q. Q. | different. Paragraph 12? I just sent it to you, and so did Kathleen. Paragraph 12? So we skipped through 5; right? You don't want to ask anything else from 5? I am on section 5, ma'am. Can you read me what it says then? "In 2010 the Board of Trumbull County Commissioners assigned plaintiff the additional duty of directing Trumbull County's 911 line." Okay. We're on the same page. Thank you for that. You're welcome. And then if you look at the answer to that paragraph, the ending of it says, "Defendant denies all remaining allegations for lack of knowledge or information sufficient to form a belief as to their truth." What was your lack of information regarding? Well, what I have right now is the journal action that shows that he was appointed by the board —journalized to the position of 911 director on 10/20 of 2010. Calling it an additional duty is different |

| | | | 49 | | | 51 |
|-------|--|----------------|--|--|----------------------|---|
| 04:13 | 1 | Q. | So what was the lack of knowledge or information | 04:17 1 | | at the as chief deputy sheriff? |
| | 2 | | about? | 2 | | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. |
| | 3 | | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Asked and | 3 | | Go ahead. |
| | 4 | | answered. | 4 | Α. | Uhm, we don't keep Trumbull County does not keep |
| | 5 | | Go ahead. | 5 | | the greatest records. And I have walked into a |
| | 6 | A. | I don't know. I don't think that anyone on the | 6 | | situation where, you know, we don't share in our |
| | 7 | | board knows what he was doing before before that | 7 | | offices, we don't share information with the other |
| | 8 | | time. | 8 | | elected officials. We can't access them. |
| | 9 | Q. | No one knew what he was doing before 2010? | 9 | | I don't I don't have what you are looking |
| | 10 | Α. | It says "The Board of Trumbull County Commissioners | 10 | | for, and I apologize. |
| | 11 | | assigned an additional duty." | 11 | Q. | I understand, but my question is, is there it |
| | 12 | | It was not an additional duty. He was newly | 12 | | says in the answer to Number 13, defendant denies, |
| | 13 | | appointed. | 13 | | or denies for lack of knowledge or information, all |
| | 14 | Q. | So what was their insufficient information to admit | 14 | | remaining allegations contained in paragraph 13. |
| | 15 | | or deny? | 15 | | So the lack of knowledge was what he did before |
| | 16 | | MS. MINAHAN: I think you are asking | 16 | | he was hired, or before 2015, or what? |
| | 17 | | her for a legal conclusion and | 17 | A. | I have to say I don't know. I don't know. I don't |
| | 18 | | MS. GROEDEL: You can just state your | 18 | | know what these |
| | 19 | | objection. That's not anything that's | 19 | Q. | Fair enough. Ma'am, that's okay. I'm not holding |
| | 20 | | filed, whether it's by an attorney or by the | 20 | | it against you. That's appreciated that you don't |
| | 21 | | client, if it's filed, the attorney is held to | 21 | | know and say you don't know. |
| | 22 | | it. And you can't claim legal conclusion when | 22 | | So let's look at 17. It says that: "Defendant |
| | 23 | | you answer a complaint on your client's behalf. | 23 | | denies, or denies for lack of information, the |
| | 24 | | So just state your objection, please, | 24 | | allegations in paragraph 17 of the amended |
| | 25 | | Kathleen, and then she can answer or she can't | 25 | | complaint." |
| | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO |
| | | | 50 | | | 52 |
| 04:15 | 1 | | answer. | 04:19 1 | | And as you can see, paragraph 17 says they |
| | 2 | | MS. MINAHAN: Well, I disagree with | 2 | | didn't notify plaintiff of his termination until |
| | 3 | | you in your statement of what the law is, but | 3 | | eight days after they terminated him. |
| | 4 | | my objection is still that it calls for a legal | 4 | | Wasn't that something that was known or should |
| | 5 | | conclusion in what you are asking her. | 5 | | have been known or could have been known? |
| | 6 | | Go ahead and answer, if you can. | 6 | | |
| | _ | | | | | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. |
| | 7 | A. | Thank you. | 7 | | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Go ahead answered. |
| | 7 8 | A. | Thank you. I believe I have answered it to the best of my | 7 8 | A. | Go ahead answered. |
| | | A. | • | | A. | Go ahead answered. |
| | 8 9 10 | A. Q. | I believe I have answered it to the best of my | 8 9 10 | A. Q. | Go ahead answered. Which one? What are you asking me? Should who |
| | 8 9 10 11 | | I believe I have answered it to the best of my ability. | 8 9 10 11 | | Go ahead answered. Which one? What are you asking me? Should who have known what? |
| , | 8 9 10 11 | | I believe I have answered it to the best of my ability. Let's look at 13. What about paragraph 13 of the | 8 9 10 11 12 | | Go ahead answered. Which one? What are you asking me? Should who have known what? In answering a complaint, a formal complaint served |
| | 8 9 10 11 12 | | I believe I have answered it to the best of my ability. Let's look at 13. What about paragraph 13 of the amended complaint did the commissioners have lack | 8 9 10 11 12 13 | | Go ahead answered. Which one? What are you asking me? Should who have known what? In answering a complaint, a formal complaint served in Federal court, defendant denied, or denied for |
| | 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. | I believe I have answered it to the best of my ability. Let's look at 13. What about paragraph 13 of the amended complaint did the commissioners have lack of information or knowledge about? | 8 9 10 11 12 13 | | Go ahead answered. Which one? What are you asking me? Should who have known what? In answering a complaint, a formal complaint served in Federal court, defendant denied, or denied for lack of information, Number 17, which simply says |
| | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q. | I believe I have answered it to the best of my ability. Let's look at 13. What about paragraph 13 of the amended complaint did the commissioners have lack of information or knowledge about? Okay. From his position of chief deputy, sheriff | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | | Go ahead answered. Which one? What are you asking me? Should who have known what? In answering a complaint, a formal complaint served in Federal court, defendant denied, or denied for lack of information, Number 17, which simply says that the defendant didn't notify him of his |
| | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. | I believe I have answered it to the best of my ability. Let's look at 13. What about paragraph 13 of the amended complaint did the commissioners have lack of information or knowledge about? Okay. From his position of chief deputy, sheriff was hired full time as Trumbull County's 911 director. On April 20th, 2016 he went from part time at 911 to full time as the director. | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. | Go ahead answered. Which one? What are you asking me? Should who have known what? In answering a complaint, a formal complaint served in Federal court, defendant denied, or denied for lack of information, Number 17, which simply says that the defendant didn't notify him of his termination until eight days after his termination. |
| | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. | I believe I have answered it to the best of my ability. Let's look at 13. What about paragraph 13 of the amended complaint did the commissioners have lack of information or knowledge about? Okay. From his position of chief deputy, sheriff was hired full time as Trumbull County's 911 director. On April 20th, 2016 he went from part time at 911 to full time as the director. Okay. So is there an insufficient what is the | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. | Go ahead answered. Which one? What are you asking me? Should who have known what? In answering a complaint, a formal complaint served in Federal court, defendant denied, or denied for lack of information, Number 17, which simply says that the defendant didn't notify him of his termination until eight days after his termination. Oh, that's not correct at all. I was there the same day that we took action, we had Steve Charles call him. |
| | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. A. Q. | I believe I have answered it to the best of my ability. Let's look at 13. What about paragraph 13 of the amended complaint did the commissioners have lack of information or knowledge about? Okay. From his position of chief deputy, sheriff was hired full time as Trumbull County's 911 director. On April 20th, 2016 he went from part time at 911 to full time as the director. Okay. So is there an insufficient what is the lack of knowledge about? | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. A. Q. | Go ahead answered. Which one? What are you asking me? Should who have known what? In answering a complaint, a formal complaint served in Federal court, defendant denied, or denied for lack of information, Number 17, which simply says that the defendant didn't notify him of his termination until eight days after his termination. Oh, that's not correct at all. I was there the same day that we took action, we had Steve Charles call him. And you were there? |
| | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. | I believe I have answered it to the best of my ability. Let's look at 13. What about paragraph 13 of the amended complaint did the commissioners have lack of information or knowledge about? Okay. From his position of chief deputy, sheriff was hired full time as Trumbull County's 911 director. On April 20th, 2016 he went from part time at 911 to full time as the director. Okay. So is there an insufficient what is the lack of knowledge about? I don't know definitively. I would only be | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. A. Q. | Go ahead answered. Which one? What are you asking me? Should who have known what? In answering a complaint, a formal complaint served in Federal court, defendant denied, or denied for lack of information, Number 17, which simply says that the defendant didn't notify him of his termination until eight days after his termination. Oh, that's not correct at all. I was there the same day that we took action, we had Steve Charles call him. And you were there? To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Charles did what |
| | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. A. Q. | I believe I have answered it to the best of my ability. Let's look at 13. What about paragraph 13 of the amended complaint did the commissioners have lack of information or knowledge about? Okay. From his position of chief deputy, sheriff was hired full time as Trumbull County's 911 director. On April 20th, 2016 he went from part time at 911 to full time as the director. Okay. So is there an insufficient what is the lack of knowledge about? I don't know definitively. I would only be guessing. | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. A. Q. A. | Go ahead answered. Which one? What are you asking me? Should who have known what? In answering a complaint, a formal complaint served in Federal court, defendant denied, or denied for lack of information, Number 17, which simply says that the defendant didn't notify him of his termination until eight days after his termination. Oh, that's not correct at all. I was there the same day that we took action, we had Steve Charles call him. And you were there? To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Charles did what he was supposed to do. |
| | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. A. Q. | I believe I have answered it to the best of my ability. Let's look at 13. What about paragraph 13 of the amended complaint did the commissioners have lack of information or knowledge about? Okay. From his position of chief deputy, sheriff was hired full time as Trumbull County's 911 director. On April 20th, 2016 he went from part time at 911 to full time as the director. Okay. So is there an insufficient what is the lack of knowledge about? I don't know definitively. I would only be guessing. We don't posses anything related to the | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. A. Q. A. | Go ahead answered. Which one? What are you asking me? Should who have known what? In answering a complaint, a formal complaint served in Federal court, defendant denied, or denied for lack of information, Number 17, which simply says that the defendant didn't notify him of his termination until eight days after his termination. Oh, that's not correct at all. I was there the same day that we took action, we had Steve Charles call him. And you were there? To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Charles did what he was supposed to do. You don't know? |
| | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. A. Q. | I believe I have answered it to the best of my ability. Let's look at 13. What about paragraph 13 of the amended complaint did the commissioners have lack of information or knowledge about? Okay. From his position of chief deputy, sheriff was hired full time as Trumbull County's 911 director. On April 20th, 2016 he went from part time at 911 to full time as the director. Okay. So is there an insufficient what is the lack of knowledge about? I don't know definitively. I would only be guessing. We don't posses anything related to the sheriff's department or previous employment. We're | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. A. Q. A. | Go ahead answered. Which one? What are you asking me? Should who have known what? In answering a complaint, a formal complaint served in Federal court, defendant denied, or denied for lack of information, Number 17, which simply says that the defendant didn't notify him of his termination until eight days after his termination. Oh, that's not correct at all. I was there the same day that we took action, we had Steve Charles call him. And you were there? To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Charles did what he was supposed to do. You don't know? The defendant I guess I don't know. So I guess |
| | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. A. Q. | I believe I have answered it to the best of my ability. Let's look at 13. What about paragraph 13 of the amended complaint did the commissioners have lack of information or knowledge about? Okay. From his position of chief deputy, sheriff was hired full time as Trumbull County's 911 director. On April 20th, 2016 he went from part time at 911 to full time as the director. Okay. So is there an insufficient what is the lack of knowledge about? I don't know definitively. I would only be guessing. We don't posses anything related to the sheriff's department or previous employment. We're different bodies. | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. A. Q. A. | Go ahead answered. Which one? What are you asking me? Should who have known what? In answering a complaint, a formal complaint served in Federal court, defendant denied, or denied for lack of information, Number 17, which simply says that the defendant didn't notify him of his termination until eight days after his termination. Oh, that's not correct at all. I was there the same day that we took action, we had Steve Charles call him. And you were there? To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Charles did what he was supposed to do. You don't know? The defendant I guess I don't know. So I guess that would be lack of information, if you don't |
| | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | Q. A. Q. | I believe I have answered it to the best of my ability. Let's look at 13. What about paragraph 13 of the amended complaint did the commissioners have lack of information or knowledge about? Okay. From his position of chief deputy, sheriff was hired full time as Trumbull County's 911 director. On April 20th, 2016 he went from part time at 911 to full time as the director. Okay. So is there an insufficient what is the lack of knowledge about? I don't know definitively. I would only be guessing. We don't posses anything related to the sheriff's department or previous employment. We're different bodies. And there was no way to look at his resume or job | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | Q. A. Q. A. | Go ahead answered. Which one? What are you asking me? Should who have known what? In answering a complaint, a formal complaint served in Federal court, defendant denied, or denied for lack of information, Number 17, which simply says that the defendant didn't notify him of his termination until eight days after his termination. Oh, that's not correct at all. I was there the same day that we took action, we had Steve Charles call him. And you were there? To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Charles did what he was supposed to do. You don't know? The defendant I guess I don't know. So I guess that would be lack of information, if you don't know what actually happened. |
| | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. A. Q. | I believe I have answered it to the best of my ability. Let's look at 13. What about paragraph 13 of the amended complaint did the commissioners have lack of information or knowledge about? Okay. From his position of chief deputy, sheriff was hired full time as Trumbull County's 911 director. On April 20th, 2016 he went from part time at 911 to full time as the director. Okay. So is there an insufficient what is the lack of knowledge about? I don't know definitively. I would only be guessing. We don't posses anything related to the sheriff's department or previous employment. We're different bodies. | 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. A. Q. A. | Go ahead answered. Which one? What are you asking me? Should who have known what? In answering a complaint, a formal complaint served in Federal court, defendant denied, or denied for lack of information, Number 17, which simply says that the defendant didn't notify him of his termination until eight days after his termination. Oh, that's not correct at all. I was there the same day that we took action, we had Steve Charles call him. And you were there? To the best of my knowledge, Mr. Charles did what he was supposed to do. You don't know? The defendant I guess I don't know. So I guess that would be lack of information, if you don't |

| | | 53 | | | 55 | | | |
|--|----------------------------|--|--|----------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| 04:21 1 | | impression that he was called the same day. To the | 04:25 1 | | MS. GROEDEL: She's sending Exhibits 4 | | | |
| 2 | | best of my knowledge, he was called, but I can't be | 2 | | and 5, which is our Requests For Admission and | | | |
| 3 | | certain. | 3 | | your answers. | | | |
| 4 | Q. | And where did you get that information from? | 4 | | MS. MINAHAN: She's moving on to topic | | | |
| 5 | A. | Mr. Charles, or from our that's who was there. | 5 6 and she is sending a new deposition exhibit. | | | | | |
| 6 | | He was the assistant. | 6 | 6 THE WITNESS: Topic 6. Okay. | | | | |
| 7 | Q. | I'm sorry, go ahead. I didn't mean to cut you off. | 7 | | | | | |
| 8 | | Yes. For Mr. Charles, he was instructed to do | 8 | | (Plaintiff's Exhibits 4 and 5 were marked for | | | |
| 9 | | that. | 9 | | purposes of identification.) | | | |
| 10 | Q. | So you don't know if he did or didn't, and he | 10 | | | | | |
| 11 | | wasn't called to | 11 | Α. | Got it. Got it. It's received, Number 3. Is this | | | |
| 12 | Α. | I believe that he was. | 12 | | am I not looking at the right one. Did I just | | | |
| 13 | Q. | Before this complaint was answered as denies or | 13 | | open the same thing? It's 11 pages? | | | |
| 14 | | denies for lack of information? | 14 | Q. | No. Let me know when you receive it. | | | |
| 15 | Α. | Yes. I believe that it would be denied because he | 15 | | | | | |
| 16 | | was notified, but he was notified by phone, and we | 16 | | (Off the record.) | | | |
| 17 | | don't know actually when he received we don't | 17 | | | | | |
| 18 | | know actually when the plaintiff received his | 18 | Q. | Number 4 is our Request, and Exhibit 5 is the | | | |
| 19 | | letter. How could we know exactly when he received | 19 | | Commission's responses. | | | |
| 20 | | it? | 20 | Α. | Okay. I have 4, and I have 5. | | | |
| 21 | Q. | Okay. So now I'm just trying to get to the basis | 21 | | Great. So I'm asking you about the ones that are | | | |
| 22 | | of it says denies. So did you review this | 22 | | identified in paragraph 6 section 6 of the | | | |
| 23 | | complaint before it was filed? | 23 | | deposition notice. | | | |
| 24 | Α. | Yes. | 24 | | | | | |
| 25 | Q. | I mean, answer to the complaint, I'm sorry, answer | 25 | Q. | So look at okay, Number 3 we already discussed. | | | |
| | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | |
| | | | | | | | | |
| | | 54 | | | 56 | | | |
| 04:22 1 | | 54 to the amended complaint. | 04:31 1 | Α. | 56 Yes. | | | |
| 04:22 1 | | | 04:31 1 | | | | | |
| - | | to the amended complaint. | | Q. | Yes. | | | |
| 2 | | to the amended complaint. And before this was filed in court was | | Q. A. | Yes. 4, this was denied? | | | |
| 3 | | to the amended complaint. And before this was filed in court was Mr. Charles called and asked if he notified | | Q. A. | Yes. 4, this was denied? Okay. | | | |
| 3 4 | | to the amended complaint. And before this was filed in court was Mr. Charles called and asked if he notified Mr. Cook the day of the termination? | 3 4 | Q. A. | Yes. 4, this was denied? Okay. That plaintiff retired from his position as chief deputy sheriff. What is the basis of that denial? | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 | A. | to the amended complaint. And before this was filed in court was Mr. Charles called and asked if he notified Mr. Cook the day of the termination? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. | 2 3 4 5 | Q. A. Q. | Yes. 4, this was denied? Okay. That plaintiff retired from his position as chief deputy sheriff. What is the basis of that denial? | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | A. Q. | to the amended complaint. And before this was filed in court was Mr. Charles called and asked if he notified Mr. Cook the day of the termination? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead. | 2 3 4 5 6 | Q. A. Q. | Yes. 4, this was denied? Okay. That plaintiff retired from his position as chief deputy sheriff. What is the basis of that denial? Plaintiff retired from his position of chief deputy sheriff basis for denial | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | | to the amended complaint. And before this was filed in court was Mr. Charles called and asked if he notified Mr. Cook the day of the termination? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead. To the to the best of my knowledge, yes. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Q. A. Q. | Yes. 4, this was denied? Okay. That plaintiff retired from his position as chief deputy sheriff. What is the basis of that denial? Plaintiff retired from his position of chief deputy sheriff basis for denial Do you know why that was denied? | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Q. | to the amended complaint. And before this was filed in court was Mr. Charles called and asked if he notified Mr. Cook the day of the termination? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead. To the to the best of my knowledge, yes. Who called him? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Q. A. Q. A. | Yes. 4, this was denied? Okay. That plaintiff retired from his position as chief deputy sheriff. What is the basis of that denial? Plaintiff retired from his position of chief deputy sheriff basis for denial Do you know why that was denied? | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Q. A. | to the amended complaint. And before this was filed in court was Mr. Charles called and asked if he notified Mr. Cook the day of the termination? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead. To the to the best of my knowledge, yes. Who called him? Mr. Charles called him. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Q. A. Q. A. | Yes. 4, this was denied? Okay. That plaintiff retired from his position as chief deputy sheriff. What is the basis of that denial? Plaintiff retired from his position of chief deputy sheriff basis for denial Do you know why that was denied? He was appointed you know what, I don't | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Q. A. | to the amended complaint. And before this was filed in court was Mr. Charles called and asked if he notified Mr. Cook the day of the termination? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead. To the to the best of my knowledge, yes. Who called him? Mr. Charles called him. No. Who called Mr. Charles before answering this | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Q. A. Q. A. | Yes. 4, this was denied? Okay. That plaintiff retired from his position as chief deputy sheriff. What is the basis of that denial? Plaintiff retired from his position of chief deputy sheriff basis for denial Do you know why that was denied? He was appointed you know what, I don't remember. I did prepare for this, but it's been | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | Q. A. | to the amended complaint. And before this was filed in court was Mr. Charles called and asked if he notified Mr. Cook the day of the termination? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead. To the to the best of my knowledge, yes. Who called him? Mr. Charles called him. No. Who called Mr. Charles before answering this as denial or denies for lack of information? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | Q. A. Q. A. | Yes. 4, this was denied? Okay. That plaintiff retired from his position as chief deputy sheriff. What is the basis of that denial? Plaintiff retired from his position of chief deputy sheriff basis for denial Do you know why that was denied? He was appointed you know what, I don't remember. I did prepare for this, but it's been like about two and a half weeks ago and I am sorry, | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | Q. A. | to the amended complaint. And before this was filed in court was Mr. Charles called and asked if he notified Mr. Cook the day of the termination? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead. To the to the best of my knowledge, yes. Who called him? Mr. Charles called him. No. Who called Mr. Charles before answering this as denial or denies for lack of information? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | Q. A. Q. A. | Yes. 4, this was denied? Okay. That plaintiff retired from his position as chief deputy sheriff. What is the basis of that denial? Plaintiff retired from his position of chief deputy sheriff basis for denial Do you know why that was denied? He was appointed you know what, I don't remember. I did prepare for this, but it's been like about two and a half weeks ago and I am sorry, I just don't remember. | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Q. A. Q. | to the amended complaint. And before this was filed in court was Mr. Charles called and asked if he notified Mr. Cook the day of the termination? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead. To the to the best of my knowledge, yes. Who called him? Mr. Charles called him. No. Who called Mr. Charles before answering this as denial or denies for lack of information? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead. I don't know. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Q. A. Q. A. | Yes. 4, this was denied? Okay. That plaintiff retired from his position as chief deputy sheriff. What is the basis of that denial? Plaintiff retired from his position of chief deputy sheriff basis for denial Do you know why that was denied? He was appointed you know what, I don't remember. I did prepare for this, but it's been like about two and a half weeks ago and I am sorry, I just don't remember. You don't know why Number 4 was denied, is that | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. | to the amended complaint. And before this was filed in court was Mr. Charles called and asked if he notified Mr. Cook the day of the termination? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead. To the to the best of my knowledge, yes. Who called him? Mr. Charles called him. No. Who called Mr. Charles before answering this as denial or denies for lack of information? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead. I don't know. You didn't call him? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. | Yes. 4, this was denied? Okay. That plaintiff retired from his position as chief deputy sheriff. What is the basis of that denial? Plaintiff retired from his position of chief deputy sheriff basis for denial Do you know why that was denied? He was appointed you know what, I don't remember. I did prepare for this, but it's been like about two and a half weeks ago and I am sorry, I just don't remember. You don't know why Number 4 was denied, is that what you are saying? | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. | to the amended complaint. And before this was filed in court was Mr. Charles called and asked if he notified Mr. Cook the day of the termination? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead. To the to the best of my knowledge, yes. Who called him? Mr. Charles called him. No. Who called Mr. Charles before answering this as denial or denies for lack of information? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead. I don't know. You didn't call him? No. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. | Yes. 4, this was denied? Okay. That plaintiff retired from his position as chief deputy sheriff. What is the basis of that denial? Plaintiff retired from his position of chief deputy sheriff basis for denial Do you know why that was denied? He was appointed you know what, I don't remember. I did prepare for this, but it's been like about two and a half weeks ago and I am sorry, I just don't remember. You don't know why Number 4 was denied, is that what you are saying? Yes. | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. | to the amended complaint. And before this was filed in court was Mr. Charles called and asked if he notified Mr. Cook the day of the termination? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead. To the to the best of my knowledge, yes. Who called him? Mr. Charles called him. No. Who called Mr. Charles before answering this as denial or denies for lack of information? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead. I don't know. You didn't call him? No. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. | Yes. 4, this was denied? Okay. That plaintiff retired from his position as chief deputy sheriff. What is the basis of that denial? Plaintiff retired from his position of chief deputy sheriff basis for denial Do you know why that was denied? He was appointed you know what, I don't remember. I did prepare for this, but it's been like about two and a half weeks ago and I am sorry, I just don't remember. You don't know why Number 4 was denied, is that what you are saying? Yes. Okay. Number 5, it wasn't answered. Oh, it was. | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. | to the amended complaint. And before this was filed in court was Mr. Charles called and asked if he notified Mr. Cook the day of the termination? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead. To the to the best of my knowledge, yes. Who called him? Mr. Charles called him. No. Who called Mr. Charles before answering this as denial or denies for lack of information? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead. I don't know. You didn't call him? No. And you didn't hear anyone else call him; correct? No. I didn't personally hear anyone call him. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. | Yes. 4, this was denied? Okay. That plaintiff retired from his position as chief deputy sheriff. What is the basis of that denial? Plaintiff retired from his position of chief deputy sheriff basis for denial Do you know why that was denied? He was appointed you know what, I don't remember. I did prepare for this, but it's been like about two and a half weeks ago and I am sorry, I just don't remember. You don't know why Number 4 was denied, is that what you are saying? Yes. Okay. Number 5, it wasn't answered. Oh, it was. It was denied. Why was that denied? | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. | to the amended complaint. And before this was filed in court was Mr. Charles called and asked if he notified Mr. Cook the day of the termination? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead. To the to the best of my knowledge, yes. Who called him? Mr. Charles called him. No. Who called Mr. Charles before answering this as denial or denies for lack of information? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead. I don't know. You didn't call him? No. And you didn't hear anyone else call him; correct? No. I didn't personally hear anyone call him. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. | Yes. 4, this was denied? Okay. That plaintiff retired from his position as chief deputy sheriff. What is the basis of that denial? Plaintiff retired from his position of chief deputy sheriff basis for denial Do you know why that was denied? He was appointed you know what, I don't remember. I did prepare for this, but it's been like about two and a half weeks ago and I am sorry, I just don't remember. You don't know why Number 4 was denied, is that what you are saying? Yes. Okay. Number 5, it wasn't answered. Oh, it was. It was denied. Why was that denied? Defendant denies that in 2015 plaintiff was rehired | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. | to the amended complaint. And before this was filed in court was Mr. Charles called and asked if he notified Mr. Cook the day of the termination? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead. To the to the best of my knowledge, yes. Who called him? Mr. Charles called him. No. Who called Mr. Charles before answering this as denial or denies for lack of information? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead. I don't know. You didn't call him? No. And you didn't hear anyone else call him; correct? No. I didn't personally hear anyone call him. Okay. So let's look at 26. We looked at 26 | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. | Yes. 4, this was denied? Okay. That plaintiff retired from his position as chief deputy sheriff. What is the basis of that denial? Plaintiff retired from his position of chief deputy sheriff basis for denial Do you know why that was denied? He was appointed you know what, I don't remember. I did prepare for this, but it's been like about two and a half weeks ago and I am sorry, I just don't remember. You don't know why Number 4 was denied, is that what you are saying? Yes. Okay. Number 5, it wasn't answered. Oh, it was. It was denied. Why was that denied? Defendant denies that in 2015 plaintiff was rehired as the full-time I don't believe that he was | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. | to the amended complaint. And before this was filed in court was Mr. Charles called and asked if he notified Mr. Cook the day of the termination? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead. To the to the best of my knowledge, yes. Who called him? Mr. Charles called him. No. Who called Mr. Charles before answering this as denial or denies for lack of information? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead. I don't know. You didn't call him? No. And you didn't hear anyone else call him; correct? No. I didn't personally hear anyone call him. Okay. So let's look at 26. We looked at 26 already. And 27 is fine. Okay. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. | Yes. 4, this was denied? Okay. That plaintiff retired from his position as chief deputy sheriff. What is the basis of that denial? Plaintiff retired from his position of chief deputy sheriff basis for denial Do you know why that was denied? He was appointed you know what, I don't remember. I did prepare for this, but it's been like about two and a half weeks ago and I am sorry, I just don't remember. You don't know why Number 4 was denied, is that what you are saying? Yes. Okay. Number 5, it wasn't answered. Oh, it was. It was denied. Why was that denied? Defendant denies that in 2015 plaintiff was rehired as the full-time I don't believe that he was rehired. I believe he was appointed. I believe he | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. | to the amended complaint. And before this was filed in court was Mr. Charles called and asked if he notified Mr. Cook the day of the termination? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead. To the to the best of my knowledge, yes. Who called him? Mr. Charles called him. No. Who called Mr. Charles before answering this as denial or denies for lack of information? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead. I don't know. You didn't call him? No. And you didn't hear anyone else call him; correct? No. I didn't personally hear anyone call him. Okay. So let's look at 26. We looked at 26 already. And 27 is fine. Okay. I sent you the Request For Admissions of the | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. | Yes. 4, this was denied? Okay. That plaintiff retired from his position as chief deputy sheriff. What is the basis of that denial? Plaintiff retired from his position of chief deputy sheriff basis for denial Do you know why that was denied? He was appointed you know what, I don't remember. I did prepare for this, but it's been like about two and a half weeks ago and I am sorry, I just don't remember. You don't know why Number 4 was denied, is that what you are saying? Yes. Okay. Number 5, it wasn't answered. Oh, it was. It was denied. Why was that denied? Defendant denies that in 2015 plaintiff was rehired as the full-time I don't believe that he was rehired. I believe he was appointed. I believe he | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. | to the amended complaint. And before this was filed in court was Mr. Charles called and asked if he notified Mr. Cook the day of the termination? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead. To the to the best of my knowledge, yes. Who called him? Mr. Charles called him. No. Who called Mr. Charles before answering this as denial or denies for lack of information? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead. I don't know. You didn't call him? No. And you didn't hear anyone else call him; correct? No. I didn't personally hear anyone call him. Okay. So let's look at 26. We looked at 26 already. And 27 is fine. Okay. I sent you the Request For Admissions of the Denial let me have Christina do that. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. | Yes. 4, this was denied? Okay. That plaintiff retired from his position as chief deputy sheriff. What is the basis of that denial? Plaintiff retired from his position of chief deputy sheriff basis for denial Do you know why that was denied? He was appointed you know what, I don't remember. I did prepare for this, but it's been like about two and a half weeks ago and I am sorry, I just don't remember. You don't know why Number 4 was denied, is that what you are saying? Yes. Okay. Number 5, it wasn't answered. Oh, it was. It was denied. Why was that denied? Defendant denies that in 2015 plaintiff was rehired as the full-time I don't believe that he was rehired. I believe he was appointed. Wasn't there a break in his employment, ma'am? | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. | to the amended complaint. And before this was filed in court was Mr. Charles called and asked if he notified Mr. Cook the day of the termination? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead. To the to the best of my knowledge, yes. Who called him? Mr. Charles called him. No. Who called Mr. Charles before answering this as denial or denies for lack of information? MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Foundation. Go ahead. I don't know. You didn't call him? No. And you didn't hear anyone else call him; correct? No. I didn't personally hear anyone call him. Okay. So let's look at 26. We looked at 26 already. And 27 is fine. Okay. I sent you the Request For Admissions of the Denial let me have Christina do that. MS. GROEDEL: Christina is sending now | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. | Yes. 4, this was denied? Okay. That plaintiff retired from his position as chief deputy sheriff. What is the basis of that denial? Plaintiff retired from his position of chief deputy sheriff basis for denial Do you know why that was denied? He was appointed you know what, I don't remember. I did prepare for this, but it's been like about two and a half weeks ago and I am sorry, I just don't remember. You don't know why Number 4 was denied, is that what you are saying? Yes. Okay. Number 5, it wasn't answered. Oh, it was. It was denied. Why was that denied? Defendant denies that in 2015 plaintiff was rehired as the full-time I don't believe that he was rehired. I believe he was appointed. Wasn't there a break in his employment, ma'am? I don't know. | | | |

| | | | 57 | | | 59 | | | | |
|-------|--|----------------|---|--|--------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| 04:33 | 1 | Q. | You don't know why this was denied? | 04:38 1 | Q. | Okay, 28. You would agree, and we discussed this, | | | | |
| | 2 | A. | I don't remember. | 2 | | that he has been replaced with an interim 911 | | | | |
| | 3 | Q. | Okay. 7, did you initiate the termination of five | 3 | | director; correct? | | | | |
| | 4 | | employees who were 50 or older? | 4 | | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. | | | | |
| | 5 | A. | No. | 5 | 5 Go ahead. | | | | | |
| | 6 | Q. | Okay. Next is 13 or 12. We did 13. | 6 | | | | | | |
| | 7 | | We looked, during your deposition, about some | 7 | | because in my understanding they're not replaced | | | | |
| | 8 | | e-mails or text messages or WhatsApp messages or | 8 | | unless it's a formal we haven't found anyone | | | | |
| | 9 | | Facebook messages you shared with someone about | 9 | | yet, so I disagree with saying that he's been | | | | |
| | 10 | | some employees that you wanted to get rid of. One | 10 | | replaced. There is someone temporarily performing | | | | |
| | 11 | | of them was Ernest Cook; correct? | 11 | | his duties. | | | | |
| | 12 | A. | Okay. You told me to look at 13, and 13 says fire | 12 | Q. | For more than a year, for 14 months; correct? | | | | |
| | 13 | | or bully senior employees, but you are asking me | 13 | A. | Yes. | | | | |
| | 14 | | something different. | 14 | Q. | Thank you. | | | | |
| | 15 | | Will you, please, just ask me because whenever | 15 | A. | Without an HR director there, too, so we have not | | | | |
| | 16 | | you lump it with in response to 13, it's confusing | 16 | | had an HR director for a permanent one | | | | |
| | 17 | | for me. | 17 | Q. | That's not the question, but thank you. | | | | |
| | 18 | Q. | Do you recall don't look at anything. Okay? | 18 | A. | Okay. | | | | |
| | 19 | A. | Uh-huh. | 19 | Q. | Thanks. | | | | |
| | 20 | Q. | Do you recall that we looked, in your deposition, | 20 | | Is the woman who is everyone has been | | | | |
| | 21 | | at a series of e-mail or text message or Facebook | 21 | | calling Ms. Goldner, in these depositions, as the | | | | |
| | 22 | | exchanges you had with someone in which you talked | 22 | | interim 911 director, so I'm going to keep using | | | | |
| | 23 | | about wanting to get rid of several employees? | 23 | | the phrase and ask if she has at least ten years | | | | |
| | 24 | A. | I don't recall the specific messages. Do you have | 24 | | less managerial experience than Mr. Cook? | | | | |
| | 25 | | them to refresh my memory? | 25 | A. | I don't know. | | | | |
| | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | | |
| | | | 58 | | | 60 | | | | |
| 04:36 | 1 | Q. | If you don't remember, you don't remember. You | 04:39 1 | | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. I don't | | | | |
| | 2 | | don't remember the e-mail exchange? | 2 | | think that's in the topic list. | | | | |
| | 3 | Α. | Somewhat. I don't remember the specifics, and I | 3 | | MS. GROEDEL: 29, it is. It's Number | | | | |
| | 4 | | don't want to say, yes, if I'm not looking at it to | 4 | | 6, section 6, Number 29. | | | | |
| | 5 | _ | see exactly what was said in that correspondence. | 5 | | MS. MINAHAN: Number 29? Oh, okay. | | | | |
| | 6 | Q. | Look at Number 17, please. | 6 | _ | Okay. | | | | |
| | 7 | Α. | | 7 | Q. | Regardless of whether you want to call him a | | | | |
| | 8 | Q. | It says: "Admit or deny that defendants failed to | 8 | | replacement or interim or whatever her, I mean, | | | | |
| | 9 | | contact plaintiff formally in writing regarding his | | | | | | | |
| | 40 | | . , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , | 9 | | is it accurate that Miss Goldner has at least ten | | | | |
| | 10 | | termination until eight days after the effective | 10 | • | years less managerial experience than Mr. Cook? | | | | |
| | 11 | | termination until eight days after the effective date of his termination." And that was denied. Do | 10 11 | | years less managerial experience than Mr. Cook? I'm not sure without looking. | | | | |
| | 11 12 | ^ | termination until eight days after the effective date of his termination." And that was denied. Do you see that? | 10 11 12 | | years less managerial experience than Mr. Cook? I'm not sure without looking. Okay. We talked about that, 34. | | | | |
| | 11 12 13 | | termination until eight days after the effective date of his termination." And that was denied. Do you see that? Yes. | 10 11 12 13 | Q. | years less managerial experience than Mr. Cook? I'm not sure without looking. Okay. We talked about that, 34. Look at 37, please. | | | | |
| | 11 12 13 14 | | termination until eight days after the effective date of his termination." And that was denied. Do you see that? Yes. And then it says he was terminated on Thursday, | 10 11 12 13 14 | Q. A. | years less managerial experience than Mr. Cook? I'm not sure without looking. Okay. We talked about that, 34. Look at 37, please. Yes. Okay. | | | | |
| | 11 12 13 14 15 | | termination until eight days after the effective date of his termination." And that was denied. Do you see that? Yes. And then it says he was terminated on Thursday, January 21, and the letter notifying him was dated | 10 11 12 13 14 | Q. A. | years less managerial experience than Mr. Cook? I'm not sure without looking. Okay. We talked about that, 34. Look at 37, please. Yes. Okay. Is the I know this was denied because the | | | | |
| | 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. | termination until eight days after the effective date of his termination." And that was denied. Do you see that? Yes. And then it says he was terminated on Thursday, January 21, and the letter notifying him was dated January 25th, 2021. Is that accurate? | 10 11 12 13 14 15 | Q. A. | years less managerial experience than Mr. Cook? I'm not sure without looking. Okay. We talked about that, 34. Look at 37, please. Yes. Okay. Is the I know this was denied because the complaint speaks for itself, but the question is | | | | |
| | 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. | termination until eight days after the effective date of his termination." And that was denied. Do you see that? Yes. And then it says he was terminated on Thursday, January 21, and the letter notifying him was dated January 25th, 2021. Is that accurate? That's the next Monday, yes. | 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. A. | years less managerial experience than Mr. Cook? I'm not sure without looking. Okay. We talked about that, 34. Look at 37, please. Yes. Okay. Is the I know this was denied because the complaint speaks for itself, but the question is did Ms. Godfrey's complaint allege the things | | | | |
| | 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. | termination until eight days after the effective date of his termination." And that was denied. Do you see that? Yes. And then it says he was terminated on Thursday, January 21, and the letter notifying him was dated January 25th, 2021. Is that accurate? That's the next Monday, yes. Okay. 26, I'll forego that one. | 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. A. Q. | years less managerial experience than Mr. Cook? I'm not sure without looking. Okay. We talked about that, 34. Look at 37, please. Yes. Okay. Is the I know this was denied because the complaint speaks for itself, but the question is did Ms. Godfrey's complaint allege the things stated in Number 37? | | | | |
| | 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. A. Q. | termination until eight days after the effective date of his termination." And that was denied. Do you see that? Yes. And then it says he was terminated on Thursday, January 21, and the letter notifying him was dated January 25th, 2021. Is that accurate? That's the next Monday, yes. Okay. 26, I'll forego that one. The question about Number 27 is were | 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. A. | years less managerial experience than Mr. Cook? I'm not sure without looking. Okay. We talked about that, 34. Look at 37, please. Yes. Okay. Is the I know this was denied because the complaint speaks for itself, but the question is did Ms. Godfrey's complaint allege the things stated in Number 37? Oh, I can't remember. I didn't look closely at | | | | |
| | 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. A. Q. | termination until eight days after the effective date of his termination." And that was denied. Do you see that? Yes. And then it says he was terminated on Thursday, January 21, and the letter notifying him was dated January 25th, 2021. Is that accurate? That's the next Monday, yes. Okay. 26, I'll forego that one. The question about Number 27 is were 27, I don't have. Are you talking about 28? | 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Q. A. Q. | years less managerial experience than Mr. Cook? I'm not sure without looking. Okay. We talked about that, 34. Look at 37, please. Yes. Okay. Is the I know this was denied because the complaint speaks for itself, but the question is did Ms. Godfrey's complaint allege the things stated in Number 37? Oh, I can't remember. I didn't look closely at that complaint because I don't even know if the | | | | |
| | 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. A. Q. | termination until eight days after the effective date of his termination." And that was denied. Do you see that? Yes. And then it says he was terminated on Thursday, January 21, and the letter notifying him was dated January 25th, 2021. Is that accurate? That's the next Monday, yes. Okay. 26, I'll forego that one. The question about Number 27 is were 27, I don't have. Are you talking about 28? No. Answer 27 on Exhibit 5. | 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. A. Q. | years less managerial experience than Mr. Cook? I'm not sure without looking. Okay. We talked about that, 34. Look at 37, please. Yes. Okay. Is the I know this was denied because the complaint speaks for itself, but the question is did Ms. Godfrey's complaint allege the things stated in Number 37? Oh, I can't remember. I didn't look closely at that complaint because I don't even know if the commissioners were I can't remember. I didn't | | | | |
| | 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. A. Q. | termination until eight days after the effective date of his termination." And that was denied. Do you see that? Yes. And then it says he was terminated on Thursday, January 21, and the letter notifying him was dated January 25th, 2021. Is that accurate? That's the next Monday, yes. Okay. 26, I'll forego that one. The question about Number 27 is were 27, I don't have. Are you talking about 28? No. Answer 27 on Exhibit 5. MS. MINAHAN: That wasn't in the | 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 | Q. A. Q. | years less managerial experience than Mr. Cook? I'm not sure without looking. Okay. We talked about that, 34. Look at 37, please. Yes. Okay. Is the I know this was denied because the complaint speaks for itself, but the question is did Ms. Godfrey's complaint allege the things stated in Number 37? Oh, I can't remember. I didn't look closely at that complaint because I don't even know if the commissioners were I can't remember. I didn't read that. I don't remember reviewing that | | | | |
| | 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. A. Q. | termination until eight days after the effective date of his termination." And that was denied. Do you see that? Yes. And then it says he was terminated on Thursday, January 21, and the letter notifying him was dated January 25th, 2021. Is that accurate? That's the next Monday, yes. Okay. 26, I'll forego that one. The question about Number 27 is were 27, I don't have. Are you talking about 28? No. Answer 27 on Exhibit 5. MS. MINAHAN: That wasn't in the topic. | 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. A. Q. | years less managerial experience than Mr. Cook? I'm not sure without looking. Okay. We talked about that, 34. Look at 37, please. Yes. Okay. Is the I know this was denied because the complaint speaks for itself, but the question is did Ms. Godfrey's complaint allege the things stated in Number 37? Oh, I can't remember. I didn't look closely at that complaint because I don't even know if the commissioners were I can't remember. I didn't read that. I don't remember reviewing that complaint recently. | | | | |
| | 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | Q. A. Q. | termination until eight days after the effective date of his termination." And that was denied. Do you see that? Yes. And then it says he was terminated on Thursday, January 21, and the letter notifying him was dated January 25th, 2021. Is that accurate? That's the next Monday, yes. Okay. 26, I'll forego that one. The question about Number 27 is were 27, I don't have. Are you talking about 28? No. Answer 27 on Exhibit 5. MS. MINAHAN: That wasn't in the topic. MS. GROEDEL: I have it here. Oh, no. | 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. A. Q. | years less managerial experience than Mr. Cook? I'm not sure without looking. Okay. We talked about that, 34. Look at 37, please. Yes. Okay. Is the I know this was denied because the complaint speaks for itself, but the question is did Ms. Godfrey's complaint allege the things stated in Number 37? Oh, I can't remember. I didn't look closely at that complaint because I don't even know if the commissioners were I can't remember. I didn't read that. I don't remember reviewing that | | | | |
| | 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. A. Q. | termination until eight days after the effective date of his termination." And that was denied. Do you see that? Yes. And then it says he was terminated on Thursday, January 21, and the letter notifying him was dated January 25th, 2021. Is that accurate? That's the next Monday, yes. Okay. 26, I'll forego that one. The question about Number 27 is were 27, I don't have. Are you talking about 28? No. Answer 27 on Exhibit 5. MS. MINAHAN: That wasn't in the topic. | 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | Q. A. Q. | years less managerial experience than Mr. Cook? I'm not sure without looking. Okay. We talked about that, 34. Look at 37, please. Yes. Okay. Is the I know this was denied because the complaint speaks for itself, but the question is did Ms. Godfrey's complaint allege the things stated in Number 37? Oh, I can't remember. I didn't look closely at that complaint because I don't even know if the commissioners were I can't remember. I didn't read that. I don't remember reviewing that complaint recently. Okay. And look at Number 50. | | | | |

| | | | 61 | | | 63 | | | | |
|-------|--------|----|--|----------------|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| 04:42 | 1 | Q. | On what happen grounds was 50 denied? | 04:46 1 | | answering Request For Admission Number 2? | | | | |
| | 2 | A. | On a factual basis. | 2 | Α. | To my knowledge it was. We gathered everything | | | | |
| | 3 | | It says: "Admit or deny that the plaintiff | 3 | i | I mean, I witnessed employees pulling everything | | | | |
| | 4 | | self-reported his conviction to each, then, county | 4 | | and responding, so I did not personally look at | | | | |
| | 5 | | commissioner." | 5 | 5 everything that was being submitted, but I was | | | | | |
| | 6 | | To the best of my knowledge, that didn't | 6 | 6 there when it was being sent, and copies were being | | | | | |
| | 7 | | occur. | 7 | | made and things were yeah. | | | | |
| | 8 | Q. | And what is your knowledge? | 8 | Q. | Did you, or any of the commissioners, look in his | | | | |
| | 9 | A. | That the commissioners weren't made aware of it. | 9 | 1 | personnel file to be able to answer whether or not | | | | |
| 1 | 0 | Q. | Okay. Look at Number we're on now item 7 of the | 10 | | it contained any indication of numerous awards for | | | | |
| 1 | 1 | | deposition notice, and we're using the same | 11 | | leadership? | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | | documents. | 12 | Α. | I did not. I don't believe that the commissioners | | | | |
| 1 | 3 | A. | 7? | 13 | | did that. At that time we did have a human | | | | |
| 1 | 4 | Q. | Yes. So we're going to go through the ones that | 14 | | resources director there, and I would assume that | | | | |
| 1 | 5 | | the commission said it had insufficient | 15 | | he would be the person who did that, and that all | | | | |
| 1 | 6 | | information. | 16 | i | that information was given to legal counsel. | | | | |
| 1 | 7 | A. | Okay. | 17 | Q. | So that's based on your assumption and not any | | | | |
| 1 | 8 | Q. | To admit | 18 | | knowledge, right, that you state they did what you | | | | |
| 1 | 9 | A. | Okay. | 19 | | believe was done? | | | | |
| 2 | 0 | Q. | It says, Number 2, the answer of the commission was | 20 | | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. | | | | |
| 2 | 1 | | the answer to the question admit or deny that | 21 | | Go ahead. | | | | |
| 2 | 2 | | plaintiff received numerous awards for leadership | 22 | A. | Under my information and belief, that's what | | | | |
| 2 | 3 | | during his employment with Trumbull County. And | 23 | | happened, my personal information and my belief | | | | |
| 2 | 4 | | the commission answered | 24 | | that those things that I attested to occurred. | | | | |
| 2 | 5 | A. | Okay. I see. | 25 | Q. | Let's look at Number 18. What was the reasonable | | | | |
| | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | | |
| | | _ | 62 | | | 64 | | | | |
| | 1 | Q. | I'm sorry, "After having made reasonable inquiry, | 04:48 1 | | inquiry that was made to be able to answer this | | | | |
| | 2 | | Defendant is unable to admit or deny this request." | 2 | | Request For Admission which states: "Admit or deny | | | | |
| | 3 | | What was the reasonable inquiry that was made? | 3 | | that an HR employee informed Plaintiff of his | | | | |
| | 4 | Α. | I was my understanding that our human resources has | 4 | | termination"? | | | | |
| | 5 | | the files on his employment and that there wasn't | 5 | | Well, no one was wait. Admit or deny that HR | | | | |
| | 6 7 | Q. | any proof of that. That's my understanding. | 6 | | employee I can't answer that right now. I don't | | | | |
| | 8 | Q. | Ma'am, what do you know, for a fact, was done to be | 8 | | know. I spoke to this earlier about the letter | | | | |
| | 9 | | able to answer this? What was the reasonable | 9 | | that was written and sent the next Monday. I | | | | |
| | 0 | | inquiry that you have personal knowledge of having been taken? | 10 | | believe that that was sent out, just as I believe that the phone call was made. | | | | |
| | 1 | | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Personal | 11 | | | | | | |
| | 2 | | knowledge isn't a requirement of this. If you | 12 | | there at the time of Mr. Cook's termination? | | | | |
| | 3 | | are asking for her | 13 | | At the time of his termination there was an | | | | |
| | 4 | Q. | Okay. Any knowledge? | 14 | | administrative, there was an HR director there | | | | |
| | 5 | Œ. | MS. GROEDEL: You're right. Any | 15 | | were three employees no, four, I take that back, | | | | |
| | 6 | | knowledge. | 16 | | but with different duties. | | | | |
| | 7 | Α. | My answer is efforts to obtain documents from his | 17 | | | | | | |
| | 8 | ۸. | file to prove whether or not that occurred. That's | 18 | | employees to find out, with certainty, if they had | | | | |
| | 9 | | something that we worked with our attorneys on, | 19 | | or had not informed plaintiff of his termination? | | | | |
| | 20 | | which was obtaining or for our attorneys on. | 20 | | I can't I don't know. | | | | |
| | 1 | | We obtained everything that she needed in | 21 | | | | | | |
| | 2 | | order to be able to respond to these, and gathered | 22 | | That's correct. | | | | |
| | 3 | | everything and gave them to our legal counsel in | 23 | | Okay. Look at 19, what was the reasonable inquiry | | | | |
| | 4 | | order to respond to everything that was asked. | 24 | | made to be unable to determine whether the | | | | |
| | 5 | Q. | Was his personnel file reviewed in conjunction with | 25 | | commissioners whether the board told plaintiff, | | | | |
| | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | | |

| | | | 65 | | | 67 | | | | |
|-------|----------------------------|----|---|----------------|----------|---|--|--|--|--|
| 04:50 | 1 | | before this lawsuit, the cause of his termination? | 04:54 1 | | correct? | | | | |
| | 2 | A. | That's Number 19? | 2 | | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. | | | | |
| | 3 | Q. | Yep. | 3 | Α. | I don't know. | | | | |
| | 4 | A. | At no time prior to the initiation I don't know | 4 | Q. | Did you take any steps it says after having made | | | | |
| | 5 | | why this was I don't know why this was written, | 5 | | reasonable inquiry, and I am trying to figure out | | | | |
| | 6 | | because I'm of the understanding that there was a | 6 | | what inquiry the board made to be able to answer | | | | |
| | 7 | | letter sent out from human resources on the | 7 | | this specific question? | | | | |
| | 8 | | following Monday that the action took place, and | 8 | | MS. MINAHAN: Caryn, as you know, | | | | |
| | 9 | | that there was a phone call. Other than that | 9 | | lawyers frequently make that reasonable inquiry | | | | |
| | 10 | Q. | That stated the cause? | 10 | | for their client. | | | | |
| | 11 | A. | What? | 11 | | MS. GROEDEL: Well, if she doesn't | | | | |
| | 12 | Q. | That stated the cause of his termination? | 12 | | know she should you put this down and this | | | | |
| | 13 | A. | Oh, that stated the cause, I'm sorry. | 13 | | is on the list for a long time as I was going | | | | |
| | 14 | | To the best of my knowledge, there was no | 14 | | to ask this. If she doesn't know what steps | | | | |
| | 15 | | cause mentioned for his termination. So the board | 15 | | were taken, then she should just say "I don't | | | | |
| | 16 | | of commissioners officially did not give a cause. | 16 | | know" and that's fine, we'll move on. | | | | |
| | 17 | | I didn't give a cause, and, to the best of my | 17 | Q. | Is your answer to say what steps were taken, ma'am, | | | | |
| | 18 | | knowledge, no other commissioner has, but I can't | 18 | | to answer Number 19, you don't know? Ma'am? | | | | |
| | 19 | | really speak for them or discuss things that | 19 | A. | There is discussion no, I know that there was | | | | |
| | 20 | | occurred in executive session. | 20 | | discussion with the commissioners. | | | | |
| | 21 | Q. | My question was just what steps were taken to be | 21 | Q. | Now you are saying there was discussions, and one | | | | |
| | 22 | | able to answer this? | 22 | | or more of the commissioners definitely did tell | | | | |
| | 23 | A. | What steps were taken to be able to answer this? | 23 | | him, before the lawsuit, why he was terminated? | | | | |
| | 24 | | Conversation with the commissioners, and looking at | 24 | Α. | No. I mean that there was discussions with our | | | | |
| | 25 | | the journal action. Nothing was and the | 25 | | attorneys. | | | | |
| | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | | |
| | | | 66 | | | 68 | | | | |
| 04:52 | 1 | | letters, the file. There was no named cause. | 04:56 1 | Q. | Ma'am, what steps were taken to answer Number 19? | | | | |
| | 2 | Q. | So in answering it now, the answer would be admit; | 2 | Α. | What steps were taken? | | | | |
| | 3 | | correct? | 3 | | Having made reasonable inquiry, do you see that | | | | |
| | 4 | | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. | 4 | | answer under 19? | | | | |
| | 5 | Α. | I don't know the strategy or legal reasons for some | 5 | _ | Yes. | | | | |
| | 6 | _ | of these answers, so I don't | 6 | | , , | | | | |
| | 7 | Q. | I know. | 7 | | this reasonable inquiry? | | | | |
| | 8 | | In answering it now your answer would be that | 8 | | I believe I already answered this to the best of my | | | | |
| | 9 10 | | you admit that prior to the initiation of this | 9 | | ability. | | | | |
| | 11 | | lawsuit no reason was given to him for the cause of | 11 | | , , , , | | | | |
| | 12 | A. | his termination? Admit or deny that at no time I can't answer | 12 | | Are you asking me to change my answer? No. Ma'am, please just answer my questions. Stop | | | | |
| | 13 | Α. | that, because to be I mean, I know that Mr. Fuda | 13 | | playing word games. | | | | |
| | 14 | | had a very close relationship with the | 14 | _ | No. I really answered this about three times. | | | | |
| | 15 | | Commissioner Fuda had a very close relationship | 15 | | Tell me the steps that were made. | | | | |
| | 16 | | with the plaintiff, Mr. Cook. They were friends. | 16 | | I don't remember. | | | | |
| | 17 | | So they have clearly had a lot of conversations, so | 17 | | Tell me. | | | | |
| | 18 | | I don't think that it's fair to be able to say that | 18 | | I don't remember. | | | | |
| | | | | 19 | | Okay. And you don't know if any were made; | | | | |
| | | | someone might have misrepresented the hoard or had | | ۹. | ordy. And you don't know it diffy were made, | | | | |
| | 19 | | someone might have misrepresented the board or had | 20 | | correct? | | | | |
| | 19 20 | | additional sidebar conversations that no one would | 20 21 | | correct? | | | | |
| | 19 20 21 | | additional sidebar conversations that no one would be aware of. So we wouldn't really be able to | 21 | A. | I said I don't remember. I mean, I have already | | | | |
| | 19 20 21 22 | | additional sidebar conversations that no one would | _ | A. | I said I don't remember. I mean, I have already tried to answer you, but it sounds like you want me | | | | |
| | 19 20 21 | Q. | additional sidebar conversations that no one would be aware of. So we wouldn't really be able to admit or deny because someone on the board of | 21 22 | Α. | I said I don't remember. I mean, I have already | | | | |
| | 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. | additional sidebar conversations that no one would be aware of. So we wouldn't really be able to admit or deny because someone on the board of commissioners could have had conversations. | 21 22 23 | A. Q. | I said I don't remember. I mean, I have already tried to answer you, but it sounds like you want me to change my answer, so, I'm sorry, I can't recall. | | | | |

| | | | 69 | | | | 71 | | |
|-------|----------|----|---|-------|----------|----|--|--|--|
| 04:57 | 1 | | | 05:01 | 1 | | on. | | |
| | 2 | | (Off the record.) | | 2 | A. | I got all night, so go ahead. | | |
| | 3 | | | | 3 | Q. | Did you make a motion to terminate Mr. Salamone? | | |
| | 4 | Q. | Okay. Okay. Let's go on to 36. | | 4 | A. | Yes. | | |
| | 5 | A. | 36. Okay. | | 5 | Q. | Did the motion die for lack of a second? | | |
| | 6 | Q. | I'm sorry look at Number 42, please. | | 6 | A. | I don't remember. | | |
| | 7 | A. | 42, okay. | | 7 | Q. | Did one or more commissioners say you had not | | |
| | 8 | Q. | Can you tell me what steps were taken as part of | | 8 | | demonstrated cause for his termination? | | |
| | 9 | | the reasonable inquiry to answer Request For | | 9 | A. | I don't remember, but if it died for lack of a | | |
| 1 | 0 | | Admission 42? | | 10 | | second there would have been no discussion, because | | |
| 1 | 1 | A. | I believe under to the best of my knowledge, | | 11 | | the discussion only occurs after there is a second. | | |
| 1 | 2 | | that we were that the board of commissioners | | 12 | Q. | What steps were made to be able to answer this | | |
| 1 | 3 | | were asked, and that there were and that counsel | | 13 | | question? And please don't say you believe or you | | |
| 1 | 4 | | actually reviewed the meetings to hear what has | | 14 | | think. What do you know, for certainty, was done | | |
| 1 | 5 | | been said. | | 15 | | to be able to answer this question? | | |
| 1 | 6 | Q. | Do you know what was said? | | 16 | A. | I can't remember, it was a long time ago. | | |
| 1 | 7 | A. | What was said? | | 17 | Q. | Okay. 45, is that true or false? | | |
| 1 | 8 | | Well, first of all, that's not in his name. | | 18 | | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. That has | | |
| 1 | 9 | Q. | I know it said that. I see that. | | 19 | | nothing to do with anything. | | |
| 2 | 20 | A. | Okay. | | 20 | | MS. GROEDEL: You can object all you | | |
| 2 | 21 | Q. | Regardless of whether the meetings are recorded or | | 21 | | want. You can say that it's not a reason to | | |
| 2 | 22 | | not | | 22 | | tell her not to object, and if she says she | | |
| 2 | 23 | A. | Okay. | | 23 | | doesn't know she has to answer it, Kathleen. | | |
| 2 | 24 | Q. | Regardless of whether the meetings are recorded or | | 24 | | You can object about admissibility later. | | |
| 2 | 25 | | not, is it true that you made a motion to terminate | | 25 | | MS. MINAHAN: Commissioner, you can go | | |
| | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | |
| | | | 70 | | | | 72 | | |
| 05:00 | 1 | | Mr. Salamone from the transit board but it died for | 05:02 | 1 | | ahead and answer this absolutely obnoxious | | |
| | 2 | | a second? | | 2 | | request. Go ahead. | | |
| | 3 | | MS. MINAHAN: Well, objection. That's | | 3 | A. | What was the question about it? | | |
| | 4 | | not what the Request For Admission read. | | 4 | Q. | Is it true or false that on or about July 11th of | | |
| | | Α. | Exactly. | | 5 | | 2022 you were evicted from the residence where you | | |
| | 6 | | MS. GROEDEL: If I don't break it | | 6 | | were living at the time? | | |
| | 7 | | down, she's going to say "you need to break it | | 7 | A. | False. | | |
| | 8 | | down," so I'm going to break it down. | | 8 | Q. | 48: "Admit or deny that plaintiff received no | | |
| | 9 | | MS. MINAHAN: Well, I don't | | 9 | | points as a result of the two misdemeanors for | | |
| | 0 | _ | objection. | | 10 | | which he was convicted." | | |
| | | Q. | Okay. | | 11 | | And the answer is: "Defendant has made | | |
| | | Α. | I'm looking at Number 42 and I'm looking at | | 12 | | reasonable inquiry and can neither admit nor deny | | |
| | 3 | _ | Number 42, so go ahead. | | 13 | | this request." | | |
| | | Q. | Did you make a motion to terminate Mr. Salamone? | | 14 | | Please tell me what was the reasonable inquiry | | |
| | _ | Α. | Did I make a motion to terminate him? Is that the | | 15 | | made. | | |
| | 6 | _ | whole question? | | 16 | | I don't remember. | | |
| | | Q. | , , | | 17 | Q. | ' ' | | |
| | | Α. | No. Is it 42, or is it the question that you are | | 18 | | answer Number 49 that the board couldn't admit or | | |
| | 9 | ^ | posing right now? | | 19 | | deny that plaintiff's license was not suspended as | | |
| | | Ų. | I am breaking it down, okay, so that you can't | | 20 24 | | a result of either/or both of the misdemeanors for | | |
| | 21 | | complain that I'm asking too many questions in one | | 21 22 | Α. | which he was convicted? | | |
| | 22 | | question. When I ask one part of it, you complain | | 22 | _ | I know we didn't have the record at the time. | | |
| | 23 24 | ٨ | about that. You object to that. | | 23 24 | _ | What steps were taken? | | |
| | | Α. | Go ahead. | | 24 25 | Α. | · | | |
| 4 | 25 | Q. | I'm trying to get through this so we can all move | | 25 | Ų. | To be able to find out if this was true or not? MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | |
| | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | | | | |

| | | | 73 | | | 75 |
|-------|---------|----------|---|-------|-----------|--|
| 05:04 | 1 | Δ | I don't remember what steps were taken. I know we | 05:08 | 1 Q. | So you are saying that he had no power to do |
| 00.04 | 2 | Λ. | didn't have the record. | | . Q. 2 | anything on his own? |
| | 3 | 0 | I didn't hear you. | | | Absolutely. |
| | 4 | Q. Α. | , | | 4 Q. | • |
| | 5 | Α. | | | + Q. 5 | |
| | 6 | | steps were taken. Sometimes it takes a while to | | 5 6 | have been assigned that in his job duties to |
| | | | get things. I'm assuming that that was it, but I'm | | _ | investigate the matter? |
| | 7 | ^ | not allowed to assume, so I don't remember. | | | |
| | 8 | Q. | Okay. What about 51, what steps were made to be | | 8 9 | the that's not part of what they do. The human |
| | 9 10 | | able to answer whether or not Richard Jackson was | 10 | | resources director doesn't the human resources |
| | | | originally assigned to investigate the matter of | | | director doesn't investigate convictions or |
| | 11 | | plaintiff's conviction for two misdemeanors? | 1' | | misdemeanors of employees. That's just not part of |
| | 12 | Α. | Which number was it? | 12 | | their job. There are in every job description |
| | 13 | Q. | | 13 | | there are additional duties as assigned, but if |
| | 14 | A. | Admit or deny Richard Jackson was originally | 14 | | something was not assigned it would have been done |
| | 15 | | assigned to investigate well, we can't we | 15 | | by |
| | 16 | | can't yeah. To the best of my knowledge, it's | 10 | | ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,, |
| | 17 | | no. | 17 | | Was it part of his job duties |
| | 18 | Q. | Were any documents reviewed or anyone spoken to? | 18 | | |
| | 19 | | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. | 19 | | to do investigations? Yes, no, or I don't know? |
| | 20 | | Go ahead. | 20 | 0 | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. To do any |
| | 21 | A. | The answer to that is I don't know, and as a | 2 | - | investigations? |
| | 22 | | commissioner investigations are done at the behest | 22 | | MS. GROEDEL: Well, I'm trying to |
| | 23 | | of the board and with the board's knowledge. And | 23 | | break it down, and then I'm going to go |
| | 24 | | if I wasn't aware of something, and I wasn't I | 24 | 4 | further. |
| | 25 | | didn't instruct anyone to do anything, then to the | 2 | 5 A. | You are putting it all together instead of breaking |
| | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO |
| | | | 74 | | | 76 |
| 05:06 | 1 | | best of my information and knowledge then it didn't | | 1 | them down. I already explained an investigation |
| | 2 | | happen. So the answer is no. I don't know. | | 2 | for criminal things has nothing to do with what the |
| | 3 | | I have never I have never heard of this | | 3 | job duties of the human resources director are. |
| | 4 | | until I mean, I can't speak for any other | 4 | 4 Q. | . Okay. So if somebody had gone to the commissioners |
| | 5 | | commissioners, but if any of the other | | 5 | and said to you, and the other two commissioners at |
| | 6 | | commissioners caused something to happen without | | 6 | the time, "Did you assign Richard Jackson to |
| | 7 | | the majority of the board knowing, it would have | | 7 | investigate the matter," you all would have given |
| | 8 | | been a violation of the sunshine law, and because | | 8 | an answer as to yes or no; correct? Is that part |
| | 9 | | we don't have a county administrator, so in order | | 9 | correct? |
| | 10 | | to have something to happen, all three | 10 | | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. |
| | 11 | | commissioners have to discuss it in executive | 11 | | Go ahead. |
| | 12 | | session. | 12 | | No one is able to assign the board of |
| | 13 | Q. | I understand that, ma'am. What steps were taken to | 13 | | commissioner's employee a duty unless the board of |
| | 14 | _ | answer this question? | 14 | | commissioners is privy to it and has assigned it. |
| | 15 | Α. | • | 15 | | ğ , |
| | 16 | Q. | Either you know or you don't know? | 10 | | answer, "Hey, board, did you anybody here assign |
| | 17 | A. | | 17 | | Richard Jackson to investigate the matter of this |
| | 18 | | the commissioners and because it's something | 18 | _ | conviction?" Yes or no? |
| | 19 | | that only the commissioners would be able to do, | 19 | | . I can say, no, it didn't happen. That didn't |
| | 20 | | because Richard Jackson was a fiduciary who was | 20 | | happen. |
| | 21 | | only assigned to do things based on the board. | 2 | | . Okay. Thank you. |
| | 22 | | So if our legal counsel is discussing with the | 22 | | _ |
| | 23 | | commissioners and asking us if something happened, | 23 | 3 Q. | . Okay. |
| | 24 | | and we can't say and we can't say I can't say | 24 | | . There was no conversation. There was no executive |
| | 25 | | that it has, then | 2 | 5 | session. You are asking there was no public |
| | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO |

| | | | 77 | | | 79 | | |
|-------|----|----|--|----------------|----|---|--|--|
| 05:10 | 1 | | discussion, and something like that would have to | 05:14 1 | Q. | Were both files, both Matt Lewises' files checked? | | |
| | 2 | | have been decided by the board. | 2 | | MS. MINAHAN: Can you repeat what that | | |
| | 3 | | Unless one of the commissioners, or two of the | 3 | | question was? | | |
| | 4 | | commissioners, violated the sunshine law or one of | 4 | | MS. GROEDEL: She said there were two | | |
| | 5 | | them was capable and they can't act unilaterally | 5 | | Matt Lewises, and I said were both their files | | |
| | 6 | | to do something, that's the only time that this | 6 | | checked. | | |
| | 7 | | could have happened, and it didn't. | 7 | Α. | No. We didn't know which one to check. We looked | | |
| | 8 | Q. | Okay. So the answer to that one should be denied; | 8 | | at both of them and there were more than one with | | |
| | 9 | | right? | 9 | | different middle initials, so since you weren't | | |
| | 10 | | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. | 10 | | clear, we skipped and went to the next one. I | | |
| | 11 | Q. | Because the only way it could have happened was by | 11 | | wasn't able to identify I wasn't able to | | |
| | 12 | | a vote, two out of three had to vote to give him | 12 | | identify which Matt Lewis you were referencing. | | |
| | 13 | | that authority; right? Please just answer that yes | 13 | | So did you look at both Matt Lewises' personnel | | |
| | 14 | | or no. I want to make sure I'm understanding you, | 14 | | files? That's the question. | | |
| | 15 | | that it didn't happen. | 15 | | No. | | |
| | 16 | | To your knowledge, it did not happen that | 16 | Q. | | | |
| | 17 | | Richard Jackson was assigned to investigate the | 17 | | admit or deny that Angela, P-I-E-T-E-A-N-G-E-L, was | | |
| | 18 | | matter of plaintiff's conviction of the two | 18 | | allowed to resign to avoid discharge? | | |
| | 19 | | misdemeanors; correct? | 19 | Α. | | | |
| | 20 | | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. | 20 | | actually in the human resources office having the | | |
| | 21 | | Go ahead. | 21 | | staff look up her file to see what we could find, | | |
| | 22 | Α. | To my knowledge there was no assignment of that | 22 | | and insurance cards. | | |
| | 23 | | duty and there was no investigation. That's to the | 23 | Q. | | | |
| | 24 | | best of my knowledge. | 24 | | resources did you ask to look through her file? | | |
| | 25 | Q. | Okay. 54, did you or did you not tell Commissioner | 25 | Α. | Rebecca Smith and Alexandra DeVengencie-Bush. | | |
| | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | |
| | | | 78 | | | 80 | | |
| 05:12 | 1 | | Fuda that he was too old to be a commissioner? | 05:16 1 | Q. | And is it your testimony that you asked both of | | |
| | 2 | A. | No. | 2 | | them to look at her file, and they did so, and they | | |
| | 3 | | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. | 3 | | could not tell, from her file, if she was given the | | |
| | 4 | | Go ahead. | 4 | | opportunity to resign to avoid discharge? | | |
| | 5 | A. | No. | 5 | A. | There was actually no file. | | |
| | 6 | Q. | So that should be a denial; is that correct? | 6 | | That's correct, and there was no file on her. | | |
| | 7 | | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. | 7 | | I have a separation date, or a hire date of in | | |
| | 8 | | Go ahead. | 8 | | 2005, and there is I believe, based on my | | |
| | 9 | A. | I don't know what it should or shouldn't be, but | 9 | | records here, 2005, and then leaving in 2006. And | | |
| | 10 | | the answer is no. | 10 | | there was no file. | | |
| | 11 | Q. | Okay. You never told him he was too old to be a | 11 | Q. | What steps were made for Number 57? | | |
| | 12 | | commissioner; right? | 12 | A. | The same as the other ones. | | |
| | 13 | A. | I never said that. That's correct. | 13 | | Would you like me to repeat that for every | | |
| | 14 | Q. | Okay. 55, was Matt Lewis allowed to resign to | 14 | | one? | | |
| | 15 | | avoid discharge? | 15 | Q. | No. I'll summarize, and you can tell me if it's | | |
| | 16 | A. | I don't know. | 16 | | accurate or not. | | |
| | 17 | Q. | What steps were | 17 | | You asked Rebecca Smith and Alexandra to look | | |
| ' | 18 | A. | I don't know. There was more than one Matt Lewis. | 18 | | up Ted Powers' file to be able to answer this, and | | |
| | 19 | Q. | What steps were taken to be able to answer this? | 19 | | there was no file. Is that accurate, for Number | | |
| : | 20 | A. | Staff pulled records of every name that was | 20 | | 57? | | |
| : | 21 | | requested while on this one specifically, staff | 21 | A. | There were files, but based on that, because this | | |
| 2 | 22 | | looked up Matt Lewis's records and we found that | 22 | | one was reviewed, we're unable to we don't know. | | |
| | 23 | | there were two Matt Lewises. So we actually | 23 | Q. | What do you mean the file was reviewed, but you | | |
| | 24 | | researched in the county's files, actual paper | 24 | | don't know? | | |
| : | 25 | | files, and insurance cards. | 25 | A. | There is nothing in the file that indicates that | | |
| | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | |

| | | | 81 | | | 83 |
|-------|----|----|---|----------------|----|---|
| 05:18 | 1 | | Ted Powers was permitted to resign to avoid | 05:21 1 | | 9, 10, 13 and 15? |
| | 2 | | discharge. There is no agreement or anything like | 2 | Α. | 9, 10, 13 and 15. These are dates I'm sorry, |
| | 3 | | that. | 3 | | I'm not Kathleen, but these are just mostly dates |
| | 4 | Q. | Okay. Number 58, was Jim Shamrock's file reviewed | 4 | | and things that I have all written and ready to |
| | 5 | | to be able to answer Number 58? | 5 | | give you. |
| | 6 | A. | Yes. | 6 | | MS. MINAHAN: I think we should go |
| | 7 | Q. | And there was nothing in there that allowed you to | 7 | | forward. I mean, look, Commissioner |
| | 8 | - | say one way or the other; is that correct? | 8 | | Cantalamessa is still on the line, it looks |
| | 9 | A. | | 9 | | like. |
| | 10 | | There was no resignation. It appears, to my eyes, | 10 | | MR. CANTALAMESSA: I am. I just want |
| | 11 | | that they had time and retired. | 11 | | to know if we're going to get to me today, |
| | 12 | Q. | That's what you saw from the file? | 12 | | that's all. |
| | 13 | | Yes. There was a retirement. There was no | 13 | | THE WITNESS: We only have like three |
| | 14 | | resignation, there was a retirement. | 14 | | left for me, and they're very short ones. |
| | 15 | Q. | - | 15 | | MR. CANTALAMESSA: You guys let me |
| | 16 | Α. | | 16 | | know. I do have to get moving, though. |
| | 17 | | for me to prepare to take notes on to answer, so I | 17 | | MS. MINAHAN: Caryn, can we I think |
| | 18 | | didn't take note of that. | 18 | | Commissioner Cantalamessa has three topics. I |
| | 19 | Q. | Okay. 59, Tom Rush, was his file reviewed to be | 19 | | think these last four are going to go quickly. |
| | 20 | | able to answer 59? | 20 | | Can we just try to wrap it up today? |
| | 21 | Α. | His was reviewed, yes, and the insurance cards were | 21 | | THE WITNESS: That's my preference. |
| | 22 | | pulled, and there were two Tom Rushes. | 22 | | MS. GROEDEL: Well, I have a client |
| | 23 | Q. | So did you review their files? | 23 | | meeting at six that I need to prepare for. |
| | 24 | | I'm sorry, I should have waited until you finished, | 24 | | MR. CANTALAMESSA: I got to get out of |
| | 25 | | but because there were two I wasn't sure which one | 25 | | the office anyway, so |
| | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO |
| | | | 82 | | | 84 |
| 05:20 | 1 | | you wanted me to answer for, so I did not review | 1 | | THE WITNESS: I want to finish I |
| | 2 | | them. | 2 | | want to finish I want to finish mine right |
| | 3 | Q. | How about 60, employee Massuci, was his or her file | 3 | | now. I have only four of them left. I have |
| | 4 | | reviewed to be able to answer Number 60? | 4 | | been available. I thought mine started at |
| | 5 | A. | It says J this was another interesting | 5 | | noon. I have been in the meeting since noon, |
| | 6 | | situation. We tried to review everything to the | 6 | | or 12:15. I have been prepared for it to go |
| | 7 | | best of our ability, what I did with the employees, | 7 | | last Friday, because I thought it was possible |
| | 8 | | and there is no J Massuci. | 8 | | that I would be doing this Friday, but others |
| | 9 | Q. | There was no employee employed by Trumbull County | 9 | | weren't able to, and I was prepared |
| | 10 | | with the last name of Massuci? | 10 | | MS. GROEDEL: I'm just saying that I |
| | 11 | A. | No, it says J Massuci. | 11 | | won't be able to do them today. |
| | 12 | Q. | Well, regardless now I'm asking if you looked up | 12 | | THE WITNESS: Okay. In the amount of |
| | 13 | | Massuci? | 13 | | time you have been talking you could have |
| | 14 | A. | We did. | 14 | | gotten through |
| | 15 | Q. | Okay. Now my question is did you see any Massuci | 15 | | MS. GROEDEL: I set five hours for |
| | 16 | | employee, any employee or former employee by the | 16 | | these depositions, from 12:30 to 5:30. And I |
| | 17 | | name of Massuci? | 17 | | had to push off a meeting, that I didn't want |
| | 18 | A. | Yes. | 18 | | to start at six, to six. But there was |
| | 19 | Q. | Did you look in that person's file, or no? | 19 | | interruptions and delays, and whatever, and I'm |
| 2 | 20 | A. | No, ma'am. There were three Massucis. | 20 | | not blaming anyone, but it just can't all get |
| 2 | 21 | Q. | So you looked in none of them because you didn't | 21 | | done. |
| 2 | 22 | | know which one I was referring to; is that correct? | 22 | | If everyone is available, we can pick up |
| 2 | 23 | A. | That's correct. | 23 | | 9 a.m. tomorrow morning. |
| 2 | 24 | | MS. GROEDEL: Hey, Kathleen, what do | 24 | | THE WITNESS: No, I'm not finishing |
| 2 | 25 | | you want to do? It's almost 5:30 and we have | 25 | | this tomorrow. And I don't know that I'll be |
| 1 | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO |

| | | 85 | | | 87 |
|--|----------------------------------|--|--|----|---|
| 1 | | able to maybe another employee can, I can | 05:33 1 | | board the majority of the board had placed him |
| 2 | | give them my notes. | 2 | | on unpaid leave, which was contrary to law, and it |
| 3 | | I have been available too much. I can give | 3 | | was contrary to the collective bargaining |
| 4 | | you these. In the amount of time that you're | 4 | | agreement, so we entered a settlement agreement |
| 5 | | talking I can just give you the answers to | 5 | | because there was a grievance, this was a union |
| 6 | | these things, they're basically dates. Do you | 6 | | employee and it was about to go to arbitration, and |
| 7 | | want them? | 7 | | had we gone to that we would have, in my opinion, |
| 8 | | MS. MINAHAN: Can we let Commissioner | 8 | | lost because the board did something contrary to |
| 9 | | | 9 | | • • |
| 10 | | Cantalamessa go? | 10 | | the collective bargaining agreement and the revised |
| 11 | | MR. CANTALAMESSA: Thank you, | 11 | | code. |
| 12 | | Kathleen. I'm still at the office, and I'd | 12 | | So we're not permitted to violate the law and |
| 13 | | like to see my family at some point, too. I'm | 13 | | put someone on unpaid leave, and that's exactly |
| _ | | going to have to do that. | 14 | | what the majority of the board of commissioners |
| 14 | | If we can reschedule, Kathleen, will you | | | did. |
| 15 | | get ahold of me? It's no problem with me. | 15 | | So we weren't able to lawfully terminate |
| 16 | | MS. MINAHAN: I will. I will. | 16 17 | | someone, and what he what we did was a |
| 17 | | MR. CANTALAMESSA: Thank you so much. | | | settlement agreement between AFSCME 2493 and the |
| 18 | | MS. MINAHAN: Yep. | 18 | | board of commissioners, and it was a settlement |
| 19 | | MS. GROEDEL: Bye. | 19 | _ | that was agreed upon on 2/24/23. |
| 20 | | Let me just tell my meeting at six that I | 20 | Q. | |
| 21 | | might be late by a few minutes. One moment, | 21 | | Ohio Revised Code do you claim that he could not be |
| 22 | | please. | 22 | | lawfully terminate for failing to feed animals that |
| 23 | _ | (Discussion off the record.) | 23 | | were in his care during his as part of his job |
| 24 | Q. | Category 9, Mr. Cook had no performance evaluations | 24 | | duties? |
| 25 | | during his employment, to your knowledge; correct? | 25 | A. | Revised |
| | | | | | |
| | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO |
| 05.04 | | 86 | 25.25.4 | | 88 |
| 05:31 1 | A. | I think we were on whoa. | 05:35 1 | | 88 MS. MINAHAN: Objection. |
| 2 | Q. | 86 I think we were on whoa. We're done with 7. I'm on topic Number 9. | 2 | • | 88 MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Go ahead. |
| 2 3 | Q. | 86 I think we were on whoa. We're done with 7. I'm on topic Number 9. Topic Number 9 is plaintiff's performance | 2 3 | A. | 88 MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Go ahead. Revised Code 124.388 for administrative leave. |
| 2 3 4 | Q. | I think we were on whoa. We're done with 7. I'm on topic Number 9. Topic Number 9 is plaintiff's performance evaluations and the reason for the lack thereof. | 2 3 4 | A. | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Go ahead. Revised Code 124.388 for administrative leave. So what happened oh, you are asking why he |
| 2 3 4 5 | Q. A. | I think we were on whoa. We're done with 7. I'm on topic Number 9. Topic Number 9 is plaintiff's performance evaluations and the reason for the lack thereof. So | 2 3 4 5 | A. | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Go ahead. Revised Code 124.388 for administrative leave. So what happened oh, you are asking why he was terminated, or why he couldn't have been |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | Q. A. | I think we were on whoa. We're done with 7. I'm on topic Number 9. Topic Number 9 is plaintiff's performance evaluations and the reason for the lack thereof. So Did he ever any performance evaluations, ma'am? | 2 3 4 5 6 | A. | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Go ahead. Revised Code 124.388 for administrative leave. So what happened oh, you are asking why he was terminated, or why he couldn't have been terminated. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | Q. A. Q. A. | I think we were on whoa. We're done with 7. I'm on topic Number 9. Topic Number 9 is plaintiff's performance evaluations and the reason for the lack thereof. So Did he ever any performance evaluations, ma'am? No. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | A. | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Go ahead. Revised Code 124.388 for administrative leave. So what happened oh, you are asking why he was terminated, or why he couldn't have been terminated. Well, because the collective bargaining |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | Q. A. Q. A. | I think we were on whoa. We're done with 7. I'm on topic Number 9. Topic Number 9 is plaintiff's performance evaluations and the reason for the lack thereof. So Did he ever any performance evaluations, ma'am? No. That's all I wanted to ask about Number 9. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | A. | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Go ahead. Revised Code 124.388 for administrative leave. So what happened oh, you are asking why he was terminated, or why he couldn't have been terminated. Well, because the collective bargaining agreement prescribes the process for termination, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Q. A. Q. A. | I think we were on whoa. We're done with 7. I'm on topic Number 9. Topic Number 9 is plaintiff's performance evaluations and the reason for the lack thereof. So Did he ever any performance evaluations, ma'am? No. That's all I wanted to ask about Number 9. But it says the reasons for lack thereof. You are | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A. | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Go ahead. Revised Code 124.388 for administrative leave. So what happened oh, you are asking why he was terminated, or why he couldn't have been terminated. Well, because the collective bargaining agreement prescribes the process for termination, and in order for his case, in particular, there |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | Q. A. Q. A. | I think we were on whoa. We're done with 7. I'm on topic Number 9. Topic Number 9 is plaintiff's performance evaluations and the reason for the lack thereof. So Did he ever any performance evaluations, ma'am? No. That's all I wanted to ask about Number 9. But it says the reasons for lack thereof. You are not going to ask why? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A. | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Go ahead. Revised Code 124.388 for administrative leave. So what happened oh, you are asking why he was terminated, or why he couldn't have been terminated. Well, because the collective bargaining agreement prescribes the process for termination, and in order for his case, in particular, there was a disciplinary letter, I'm sorry, a pre what |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. | I think we were on whoa. We're done with 7. I'm on topic Number 9. Topic Number 9 is plaintiff's performance evaluations and the reason for the lack thereof. So Did he ever any performance evaluations, ma'am? No. That's all I wanted to ask about Number 9. But it says the reasons for lack thereof. You are not going to ask why? No. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | A. | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Go ahead. Revised Code 124.388 for administrative leave. So what happened oh, you are asking why he was terminated, or why he couldn't have been terminated. Well, because the collective bargaining agreement prescribes the process for termination, and in order for his case, in particular, there was a disciplinary letter, I'm sorry, a pre what is it called a conference letter to talk about |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. | I think we were on whoa. We're done with 7. I'm on topic Number 9. Topic Number 9 is plaintiff's performance evaluations and the reason for the lack thereof. So Did he ever any performance evaluations, ma'am? No. That's all I wanted to ask about Number 9. But it says the reasons for lack thereof. You are not going to ask why? No. Okay. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | A. | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Go ahead. Revised Code 124.388 for administrative leave. So what happened oh, you are asking why he was terminated, or why he couldn't have been terminated. Well, because the collective bargaining agreement prescribes the process for termination, and in order for his case, in particular, there was a disciplinary letter, I'm sorry, a pre what is it called a conference letter to talk about the allegations against him, which was sent, then |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. | I think we were on whoa. We're done with 7. I'm on topic Number 9. Topic Number 9 is plaintiff's performance evaluations and the reason for the lack thereof. So Did he ever any performance evaluations, ma'am? No. That's all I wanted to ask about Number 9. But it says the reasons for lack thereof. You are not going to ask why? No. Okay. 10, why Charles Parks was not terminated for the | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | A. | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Go ahead. Revised Code 124.388 for administrative leave. So what happened oh, you are asking why he was terminated, or why he couldn't have been terminated. Well, because the collective bargaining agreement prescribes the process for termination, and in order for his case, in particular, there was a disciplinary letter, I'm sorry, a pre what is it called a conference letter to talk about the allegations against him, which was sent, then they had that meeting, and then the board had 15 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. | I think we were on whoa. We're done with 7. I'm on topic Number 9. Topic Number 9 is plaintiff's performance evaluations and the reason for the lack thereof. So Did he ever any performance evaluations, ma'am? No. That's all I wanted to ask about Number 9. But it says the reasons for lack thereof. You are not going to ask why? No. Okay. 10, why Charles Parks was not terminated for the crimes of which he was convicted. Can you answer | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | A. | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Go ahead. Revised Code 124.388 for administrative leave. So what happened oh, you are asking why he was terminated, or why he couldn't have been terminated. Well, because the collective bargaining agreement prescribes the process for termination, and in order for his case, in particular, there was a disciplinary letter, I'm sorry, a pre what is it called a conference letter to talk about the allegations against him, which was sent, then they had that meeting, and then the board had 15 days to take action. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. | I think we were on whoa. We're done with 7. I'm on topic Number 9. Topic Number 9 is plaintiff's performance evaluations and the reason for the lack thereof. So Did he ever any performance evaluations, ma'am? No. That's all I wanted to ask about Number 9. But it says the reasons for lack thereof. You are not going to ask why? No. Okay. 10, why Charles Parks was not terminated for the crimes of which he was convicted. Can you answer that part, ma'am? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | A. | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Go ahead. Revised Code 124.388 for administrative leave. So what happened oh, you are asking why he was terminated, or why he couldn't have been terminated. Well, because the collective bargaining agreement prescribes the process for termination, and in order for his case, in particular, there was a disciplinary letter, I'm sorry, a pre what is it called a conference letter to talk about the allegations against him, which was sent, then they had that meeting, and then the board had 15 days to take action. So based on the collective bargaining |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. | I think we were on whoa. We're done with 7. I'm on topic Number 9. Topic Number 9 is plaintiff's performance evaluations and the reason for the lack thereof. So Did he ever any performance evaluations, ma'am? No. That's all I wanted to ask about Number 9. But it says the reasons for lack thereof. You are not going to ask why? No. Okay. 10, why Charles Parks was not terminated for the crimes of which he was convicted. Can you answer that part, ma'am? Yes. Well, This is feedback. It's really bad. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A. | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Go ahead. Revised Code 124.388 for administrative leave. So what happened oh, you are asking why he was terminated, or why he couldn't have been terminated. Well, because the collective bargaining agreement prescribes the process for termination, and in order for his case, in particular, there was a disciplinary letter, I'm sorry, a pre what is it called a conference letter to talk about the allegations against him, which was sent, then they had that meeting, and then the board had 15 days to take action. So based on the collective bargaining agreement, if we were going to terminate we would |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. | I think we were on whoa. We're done with 7. I'm on topic Number 9. Topic Number 9 is plaintiff's performance evaluations and the reason for the lack thereof. So Did he ever any performance evaluations, ma'am? No. That's all I wanted to ask about Number 9. But it says the reasons for lack thereof. You are not going to ask why? No. Okay. 10, why Charles Parks was not terminated for the crimes of which he was convicted. Can you answer that part, ma'am? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A. | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Go ahead. Revised Code 124.388 for administrative leave. So what happened oh, you are asking why he was terminated, or why he couldn't have been terminated. Well, because the collective bargaining agreement prescribes the process for termination, and in order for his case, in particular, there was a disciplinary letter, I'm sorry, a pre what is it called a conference letter to talk about the allegations against him, which was sent, then they had that meeting, and then the board had 15 days to take action. So based on the collective bargaining agreement, if we were going to terminate we would have had to do it within 15 days of that meeting. |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. | I think we were on whoa. We're done with 7. I'm on topic Number 9. Topic Number 9 is plaintiff's performance evaluations and the reason for the lack thereof. So Did he ever any performance evaluations, ma'am? No. That's all I wanted to ask about Number 9. But it says the reasons for lack thereof. You are not going to ask why? No. Okay. 10, why Charles Parks was not terminated for the crimes of which he was convicted. Can you answer that part, ma'am? Yes. Well, This is feedback. It's really bad. MS. MINAHAN: I think it's me. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | A. | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Go ahead. Revised Code 124.388 for administrative leave. So what happened oh, you are asking why he was terminated, or why he couldn't have been terminated. Well, because the collective bargaining agreement prescribes the process for termination, and in order for his case, in particular, there was a disciplinary letter, I'm sorry, a pre what is it called a conference letter to talk about the allegations against him, which was sent, then they had that meeting, and then the board had 15 days to take action. So based on the collective bargaining agreement, if we were going to terminate we would have had to do it within 15 days of that meeting. And the board did not take action within the 15 |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. | I think we were on whoa. We're done with 7. I'm on topic Number 9. Topic Number 9 is plaintiff's performance evaluations and the reason for the lack thereof. So Did he ever any performance evaluations, ma'am? No. That's all I wanted to ask about Number 9. But it says the reasons for lack thereof. You are not going to ask why? No. Okay. 10, why Charles Parks was not terminated for the crimes of which he was convicted. Can you answer that part, ma'am? Yes. Well, This is feedback. It's really bad. MS. MINAHAN: I think it's me. (Off the record due to technical | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A. | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Go ahead. Revised Code 124.388 for administrative leave. So what happened oh, you are asking why he was terminated, or why he couldn't have been terminated. Well, because the collective bargaining agreement prescribes the process for termination, and in order for his case, in particular, there was a disciplinary letter, I'm sorry, a pre what is it called a conference letter to talk about the allegations against him, which was sent, then they had that meeting, and then the board had 15 days to take action. So based on the collective bargaining agreement, if we were going to terminate we would have had to do it within 15 days of that meeting. And the board did not take action within the 15 days, which meant that the progressive disciplinary |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. | I think we were on whoa. We're done with 7. I'm on topic Number 9. Topic Number 9 is plaintiff's performance evaluations and the reason for the lack thereof. So Did he ever any performance evaluations, ma'am? No. That's all I wanted to ask about Number 9. But it says the reasons for lack thereof. You are not going to ask why? No. Okay. 10, why Charles Parks was not terminated for the crimes of which he was convicted. Can you answer that part, ma'am? Yes. Well, This is feedback. It's really bad. MS. MINAHAN: I think it's me. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | A. | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Go ahead. Revised Code 124.388 for administrative leave. So what happened oh, you are asking why he was terminated, or why he couldn't have been terminated. Well, because the collective bargaining agreement prescribes the process for termination, and in order for his case, in particular, there was a disciplinary letter, I'm sorry, a pre what is it called a conference letter to talk about the allegations against him, which was sent, then they had that meeting, and then the board had 15 days to take action. So based on the collective bargaining agreement, if we were going to terminate we would have had to do it within 15 days of that meeting. And the board did not take action within the 15 days, which meant that the progressive disciplinary action started, and then someone made a mistake by |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. | I think we were on whoa. We're done with 7. I'm on topic Number 9. Topic Number 9 is plaintiff's performance evaluations and the reason for the lack thereof. So Did he ever any performance evaluations, ma'am? No. That's all I wanted to ask about Number 9. But it says the reasons for lack thereof. You are not going to ask why? No. Okay. 10, why Charles Parks was not terminated for the crimes of which he was convicted. Can you answer that part, ma'am? Yes. Well, This is feedback. It's really bad. MS. MINAHAN: I think it's me. (Off the record due to technical difficulties.) | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | Α. | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Go ahead. Revised Code 124.388 for administrative leave. So what happened oh, you are asking why he was terminated, or why he couldn't have been terminated. Well, because the collective bargaining agreement prescribes the process for termination, and in order for his case, in particular, there was a disciplinary letter, I'm sorry, a pre what is it called a conference letter to talk about the allegations against him, which was sent, then they had that meeting, and then the board had 15 days to take action. So based on the collective bargaining agreement, if we were going to terminate we would have had to do it within 15 days of that meeting. And the board did not take action within the 15 days, which meant that the progressive disciplinary action started, and then someone made a mistake by putting him on the board, actually the majority |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. | I think we were on whoa. We're done with 7. I'm on topic Number 9. Topic Number 9 is plaintiff's performance evaluations and the reason for the lack thereof. So Did he ever any performance evaluations, ma'am? No. That's all I wanted to ask about Number 9. But it says the reasons for lack thereof. You are not going to ask why? No. Okay. 10, why Charles Parks was not terminated for the crimes of which he was convicted. Can you answer that part, ma'am? Yes. Well, This is feedback. It's really bad. MS. MINAHAN: I think it's me. (Off the record due to technical difficulties.) You asked about why he was not terminated. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | A. | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Go ahead. Revised Code 124.388 for administrative leave. So what happened oh, you are asking why he was terminated, or why he couldn't have been terminated. Well, because the collective bargaining agreement prescribes the process for termination, and in order for his case, in particular, there was a disciplinary letter, I'm sorry, a pre what is it called a conference letter to talk about the allegations against him, which was sent, then they had that meeting, and then the board had 15 days to take action. So based on the collective bargaining agreement, if we were going to terminate we would have had to do it within 15 days of that meeting. And the board did not take action within the 15 days, which meant that the progressive disciplinary action started, and then someone made a mistake by putting him on the board, actually the majority of the board, which wasn't me, put him on unpaid |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. | I think we were on whoa. We're done with 7. I'm on topic Number 9. Topic Number 9 is plaintiff's performance evaluations and the reason for the lack thereof. So Did he ever any performance evaluations, ma'am? No. That's all I wanted to ask about Number 9. But it says the reasons for lack thereof. You are not going to ask why? No. Okay. 10, why Charles Parks was not terminated for the crimes of which he was convicted. Can you answer that part, ma'am? Yes. Well, This is feedback. It's really bad. MS. MINAHAN: I think it's me. (Off the record due to technical difficulties.) You asked about why he was not terminated. He was | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A. | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Go ahead. Revised Code 124.388 for administrative leave. So what happened oh, you are asking why he was terminated, or why he couldn't have been terminated. Well, because the collective bargaining agreement prescribes the process for termination, and in order for his case, in particular, there was a disciplinary letter, I'm sorry, a pre what is it called a conference letter to talk about the allegations against him, which was sent, then they had that meeting, and then the board had 15 days to take action. So based on the collective bargaining agreement, if we were going to terminate we would have had to do it within 15 days of that meeting. And the board did not take action within the 15 days, which meant that the progressive disciplinary action started, and then someone made a mistake by putting him on the board, actually the majority of the board, which wasn't me, put him on unpaid leave twice. And a person can't be put on leave, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. | I think we were on whoa. We're done with 7. I'm on topic Number 9. Topic Number 9 is plaintiff's performance evaluations and the reason for the lack thereof. So Did he ever any performance evaluations, ma'am? No. That's all I wanted to ask about Number 9. But it says the reasons for lack thereof. You are not going to ask why? No. Okay. 10, why Charles Parks was not terminated for the crimes of which he was convicted. Can you answer that part, ma'am? Yes. Well, This is feedback. It's really bad. MS. MINAHAN: I think it's me. (Off the record due to technical difficulties.) You asked about why he was not terminated. He was transferred from his position in absence of HR | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 | Α. | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Go ahead. Revised Code 124.388 for administrative leave. So what happened oh, you are asking why he was terminated, or why he couldn't have been terminated. Well, because the collective bargaining agreement prescribes the process for termination, and in order for his case, in particular, there was a disciplinary letter, I'm sorry, a pre what is it called a conference letter to talk about the allegations against him, which was sent, then they had that meeting, and then the board had 15 days to take action. So based on the collective bargaining agreement, if we were going to terminate we would have had to do it within 15 days of that meeting. And the board did not take action within the 15 days, which meant that the progressive disciplinary action started, and then someone made a mistake by putting him on the board, actually the majority of the board, which wasn't me, put him on unpaid leave twice. And a person can't be put on leave, according to the collective bargaining agreement, |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. A. Q. | I think we were on whoa. We're done with 7. I'm on topic Number 9. Topic Number 9 is plaintiff's performance evaluations and the reason for the lack thereof. So Did he ever any performance evaluations, ma'am? No. That's all I wanted to ask about Number 9. But it says the reasons for lack thereof. You are not going to ask why? No. Okay. 10, why Charles Parks was not terminated for the crimes of which he was convicted. Can you answer that part, ma'am? Yes. Well, This is feedback. It's really bad. MS. MINAHAN: I think it's me. (Off the record due to technical difficulties.) You asked about why he was not terminated. He was | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A. | MS. MINAHAN: Objection. Go ahead. Revised Code 124.388 for administrative leave. So what happened oh, you are asking why he was terminated, or why he couldn't have been terminated. Well, because the collective bargaining agreement prescribes the process for termination, and in order for his case, in particular, there was a disciplinary letter, I'm sorry, a pre what is it called a conference letter to talk about the allegations against him, which was sent, then they had that meeting, and then the board had 15 days to take action. So based on the collective bargaining agreement, if we were going to terminate we would have had to do it within 15 days of that meeting. And the board did not take action within the 15 days, which meant that the progressive disciplinary action started, and then someone made a mistake by putting him on the board, actually the majority of the board, which wasn't me, put him on unpaid leave twice. And a person can't be put on leave, |

| | | 89 | | | 91 |
|----------|--------|---|----------------|----------|---|
| 05:37 | 1 | they did. | 05:39 1 | | the way. |
| 2 | 2 | So because it was outside the 15 days, you are | 2 | Q. | . Okay. Well |
| 3 | 3 | not permitted to terminate. And on top of that, | 3 | Α. | . How did the board |
| 4 | 4 | the case wasn't even disposed of, so we wouldn't | 4 | Q. | . We can go through dates and all that |
| | 5 | have been you know, arguably, if we would have | 5 | | MS. GROEDEL: Kathleen, tell me what |
| 6 | 6 | terminated we would have been terminating someone | 6 | | you want to do. I have to end now. |
| 7 | 7 | who hadn't even taken a plea or been proven to be | 7 | A. | When did the board learn of the incident? It was |
| 8 | В | guilty, and they're innocent until that point. | 8 | | 7/29. |
| 9 | 9 | So it's a completely different situation, you | 9 | | MS. GROEDEL: This is off the record. |
| 10 | 0 | know, this being a person who is bound by the | 10 | | Okay, Kelli. |
| 11 | 1 | collective bargaining agreement. He's a lower | 11 | | |
| 12 | 2 | level union employee. | 12 | | (Whereupon, the deposition was adjourned at |
| 13 | 3 | MS. GROEDEL: Kathleen, I'm sorry, but | 13 | | 5:40 p.m.) |
| 14 | 4 | there is just no way I'm going to get through | 14 | | |
| 15 | 5 | this, and I have to go. I'm going to be late. | 15 | | |
| 16 | 6 | I already am going to be ten minutes late, and | 16 | | |
| 17 | 7 | I can't keep I can't get to a six o'clock | 17 | | |
| 18 | В | meeting where there are going to be other | 18 | | |
| 19 | 9 | lawyers to wait for me for 20 minutes. | 19 | | |
| 20 |) | If your client is not going to show up, we | 20 | | |
| 21 | 1 | will just say that. But I tried to get through | 21 | | |
| 22 | 2 | this, but she has long answers and | 22 | | |
| 23 | 3 | MS. MINAHAN: I don't think I | 23 | | |
| 24 | 4 | really I think this can be done in ten | 24 | | |
| 25 | 5 | minutes. | 25 | | |
| | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | | | MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO |
| | | 90 | 1 | | 92 <u>C E R T I F I C A T E</u> |
| 05:38 1 | 1 | MS. GROEDEL: I can't I can't I | 3 | Th | ne State of Ohio,) |
| 2 | 2 | can't. To be quite honest, I can't okay. | 4 | Co |) SS: ounty of Cuyahoga.) |
| 3 | 3 | There were issues with Zoom and this and that, | 5 | | , , , , |
| 4 | 4 | but I'm already late. I gave five hours. I | 6 | | I, Kelli Rae Page, a Notary Public within |
| | 5 | told you that I had I said I'm sure that we | | | nd for the State of Ohio, and authorized to administer |
| • | 6 | can be done by 5:30, but I did not know | 7 | ce | aths and to take and certify depositions, do hereby ertify that the above-named witness, MICHELE NICOLE |
| 7 | 7 / | A. Anything that's not the dates and the dollars | 8 | de | RENCHKO, was by me, before the giving of her eposition, first duly sworn to testify the truth, the |
| 8 | В | per hour, these other things can be given, but the | 9 | | hole truth, and nothing but the truth; that the eposition as above-set forth was reduced to writing by |
| 9 | 9 | questions about the situation | 10 | m | e by means of stenotypy, and was later transcribed into |
| 10 | | Q. Well, you keep saying that, but your answers are | 11 | re | cord of the testimony given by the witness, and was abscribed by said witness remotely by agreement of the |
| 11 | | not that way. | 12 | ра | arties; that said deposition was taken at the |
| 12 | | A. It seems like you're I'm trying to explain it. | 13 | pu | orementioned time, date and place, and was adjourned, ursuant to notice or stipulations of counsel; that I am |
| 13 | | MS. GROEDEL: I just want to say, are | 14 | ра | ot a relative or employee or attorney of any of the arties, or a relative or employee of such attorney or |
| 14 | | we going to finish at another time? I can't | 15 | th | nancially interested in this action. I am not, nor is se court reporting firm with which I am affiliated, |
| 15 | | even say how long it will take because her | 16 | | nder a contract as defined in Civil Rule 28 (D). |
| 16 | | answers defy the normal course of what I'm used | 17 | | |
| 17 | | to in question/answer, question/answer. | 18 | | |
| 18 | | She makes me ask questions many times, | | | IN WITHERS WHERE I have been been been been |
| 19 | | break them down, then not break them down, and | 19 | an | IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand nd seal of office, at Cleveland, Ohio, this <u>9th</u> day of |
| 20 | | she gives long answers that aren't relevant to | 20 | | <u>ay</u> , A.D. 20 <u>23</u> . |
| 21 | ı | the questions I have asked, and I can't get | 21 | | |
| | , | | 22 | | |
| 22 | | done in ten minutes. | 22 | | |
| 23 | 3 | And I'm already going to be ten minutes | 23 | | elli Rae Page |
| 23 24 | 3 4 | And I'm already going to be ten minutes late. I cannot make other lawyers wait. | | Ke | elli Rae Page |
| 23 | 3 4 | And I'm already going to be ten minutes | 23 | Ke Ke | elli Rae Page elli Rae Page, Notary Public, State of Ohio y commission expires October 30, 2025. |

| 1 | DEPOSITION ERRATA SHEET | 93 |
|-------|--|----|
| 2 | RE: UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | |
| 3 | NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO EASTERN DIVISION | |
| 4 | CASE NO. 4:22-CV-00077-BYP, JUDGE BENITA PEARSON | |
| | Deponent: MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO Deposition Date: May 1, 2023 | |
| | To the Reporter: | |
| | I have read the entire transcript of my Deposition taken in the above-captioned matter or the same has been read | |
| | to me. I request that the following changes be entered upon the record for the reasons indicated. I have signed my name to the Errata Sheet and authorize you to | |
|) | attach said Errata Sheet to the original transcript. | |
|) | page line correction | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | NO CHANGES | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | Michele Nicole Frenchko Date MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO | |

| 1 [7] - 1:14, 4:25, 6:2, 6:3, 6:4, 93:5 10 [5] - 5:24, 6:4, 83:1, 83:2, 86:13 10/20 [1] - 48:22 11 [1] - 55:13 11th [1] - 72:4 12 [7] - 41:22, 42:18, 47:17, 47:21, 48:2, 48:4, 57:6 124.388 [2] - 19:21, 88:3 1249 [1] - 1:18 1291 [1] - 2:6 | 50:15 21 [5] - 3:7, 43:4, 43:7, 43:20, 58:15 216.316.3258 [1] - 1:19 216.831.0042 [1] - 2:11 2493 [1] - 87:17 25th [1] - 58:16 26 [3] - 54:19, 58:18 27 [4] - 54:20, 58:19, 58:20, 58:21 28 [3] - 58:20, 59:1, 92:15 28601 [1] - 2:10 29 [3] - 60:3, 60:4, 60:5 2:21 [1] - 1:13 | 55:18, 55:20, 56:16, 58:21 50 [3] - 57:4, 60:24, 61:1 51 [2] - 73:8, 73:13 54 [1] - 77:25 55 [2] - 3:8, 78:14 56 [1] - 79:16 57 [2] - 80:11, 80:20 58 [2] - 81:4, 81:5 59 [2] - 81:4, 81:5 59 [2] - 81:19, 81:20 5:30 [3] - 82:25, 84:16, 90:6 5:40 [1] - 91:13 | above-captioned [1] - 93:7 above-named [1] - 92:7 above-set [1] - 92:9 absence [1] - 86:24 absolutely [2] - 72:1, 75:3 accept [8] - 25:16, 25:22, 25:24, 26:4, 26:10, 26:12, 26:17, 29:9 acceptable [1] - 7:20 accepted [1] - 26:5 access [1] - 51:8 according [1] - 88:24 |
|---|---|--|---|
| 12:15 [1] - 84:6 | | | accurate [11] - 22:14, |
| 12:30 [1] - 84:16 13 [14] - 5:24, 6:4, 50:10, 51:12, 51:14, 57:6, 57:12, 57:16, 83:1, 83:2, 90:25 | 3 3 8 3 8 3 6 6 3 6 6 6 6 6 6 7 8 8 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 9 | 6 [9] - 5:24, 6:4, 46:15, 55:5, 55:6, 55:22, 60:4 60 [2] - 82:3, 82:4 600 [1] - 2:10 | 22:15, 22:17, 31:14, 38:14, 38:21, 40:3, 58:16, 60:9, 80:16, 80:19 accusation [1] - 16:24 |
| 14 [4] - 33:9, 33:11, | 30 [4] - 37:19, 38:16, | 7 | accused [1] - 12:9 |
| 33:14, 59:12 15 _[12] - 5:23, 5:24, 6:4, 33:22, 42:24, 43:4, 83:1, 83:2, 88:13, 88:17, 88:18, 89:2 17 _[5] - 51:22, 51:24, | 38:21, 92:25 33486 [1] - 2:6 34 [1] - 60:12 36 [2] - 69:4, 69:5 37 [2] - 60:13, 60:18 3rd [1] - 10:18 | 7 [7] - 5:24, 6:4, 46:18, 57:3, 61:10, 61:13, 86:2 7/29 [1] - 91:8 | acknowledged [1] - 25:21 act [1] - 77:5 action [11] - 7:13, 19:10, 35:8, 48:19, 52:16, 65:8, 65:25, 88:14, |
| 52:1, 52:12, 58:6 | | 8 | 88:18, 88:20, 92:14 |
| 18 [6] - 36:20, 37:2, 38:14, 63:25 | 4 | 8 [1] - 32:23 | actions [5] - 6:24, 7:2, 23:9, 23:22, 24:8 |
| 19 [7] - 41:21, 42:22, | 4 [16] - 3:3, 3:8, 5:24, | 0 | acts [1] - 32:1 |
| 64:23, 65:2, 67:18, 68:1, 68:4 | 6:4, 30:13, 30:16, 30:18, 54:24, 54:25, | 9 | actual [1] - 78:24 |
| 2 2 [12] - 1:18, 3:7, 7:22, 9:11, 9:14, 10:4, 21:1, 21:4, 46:6, 46:7, 61:20, 63:1 2/24/23 [1] - 87:19 20 [9] - 42:3, 42:6, 42:7, 42:17, 42:22, 42:23, | 55:1, 55:8, 55:18, 55:20, 56:2, 56:13 4/24 [1] - 5:4 42 [6] - 69:6, 69:7, 69:10, 70:12, 70:13, 70:18 440.230.3803 [1] - 2:7 44107 [1] - 1:19 44122 [1] - 2:5 | 9 [9] - 5:24, 6:4, 83:1, 83:2, 84:23, 85:24, 86:2, 86:3, 86:8 911 [12] - 14:23, 14:24, 15:4, 36:17, 44:14, 45:7, 48:10, 48:21, 50:14, 50:16, 59:2, 59:22 9th [1] - 92:19 | additional [7] - 37:18, 48:9, 48:23, 49:11, 49:12, 66:20, 75:13 address [1] - 9:13 adjourned [2] - 91:12, 92:12 administer [1] - 92:6 administrative [3] - 20:1, 64:14, 88:3 administrator [1] - 74:9 |
| 43:16, 89:19 | 45 [1] - 71:17 | Α | admissibility [1] - 71:24 Admission [5] - 55:2, |
| 2005 [2] - 80:8, 80:9 2006 [1] - 80:9 2010 [3] - 48:8, 48:22, 49:9 2015 [2] - 51:16, 56:18 2016 [1] - 50:15 2020 [1] - 20:19 | 47 [1] - 3:7 48 [1] - 72:8 49 [2] - 72:17, 72:18 4:22-CV-00077-BYP [2] - 1:5, 93:3 4:30 [1] - 38:10 | A.D [1] - 92:20 a.m [1] - 84:23 ability [4] - 4:22, 50:9, 68:9, 82:7 able [30] - 7:22, 18:11, 45:18, 62:8, 62:22, | 63:1, 64:2, 69:10, 70:4 Admissions [1] - 54:21 admit [14] - 49:14, 58:8, 61:18, 61:21, 62:2, 64:2, 64:5, 66:2, 66:9, 66:22, 72:12, 72:18, 73:14, 79:17 |
| 2021 [4] - 10:18, 10:19, | 5 | 63:9, 64:1, 65:22, 65:23, 66:18, 66:21, | Admit [3] - 61:3, 66:12, |
| 33:23, 58:16 2022 [2] - 20:20, 72:5 2023 [3] - 1:14, 92:20, 93:5 2025 [1] - 92:25 208 [1] - 2:5 20th [3] - 20:19, 20:20, | 5 [23] - 3:8, 5:24, 6:4, 30:12, 30:13, 30:20, 31:2, 31:12, 45:24, 45:25, 47:14, 48:4, 48:5, 48:6, 54:24, 54:25, 55:2, 55:8, | 67:6, 71:12, 71:15, 72:17, 72:25, 73:9, 74:19, 76:12, 78:19, 79:11, 80:18, 81:5, 81:20, 82:4, 84:9, 84:11, 85:1, 87:15T | 72:8 adult [1] - 40:17 adverse [1] - 35:8 advice [1] - 29:14 advised [1] - 27:4 affect [1] - 4:21 affiliated [1] - 92:15 |

aforementioned [1] -92:12 **AFSCME** [1] - 87:17 afterwards [2] - 27:15, 27:22 age [4] - 4:1, 37:24, 38:4, 38:5 agenda [1] - 19:16 ago [4] - 6:20, 22:10, 56:11, 71:16 agree [1] - 59:1 agreed [5] - 25:16, 25:21, 26:12, 26:17, 87:19 agreement [14] - 15:11, 25:24, 26:9, 29:9, 81:2, 87:4, 87:9, 87:17, 88:8, 88:16, 88:24, 89:11, 92:11 ahead [35] - 7:25, 8:1, 8:3, 9:24, 10:1, 35:14, 35:17, 36:25, 37:5, 39:17, 41:3, 41:19, 43:24, 45:10, 49:5, 50:6, 51:3, 52:7, 53:7, 54:6, 54:13, 59:5, 63:21, 70:13, 70:24, 71:2, 72:1, 72:2, 73:20, 76:11, 77:21, 78:4, 78:8, 88:2 ahold [1] - 85:15 Alex [1] - 7:18 Alexandra [3] - 7:9, 79:25, 80:17 allegations [6] - 46:8, 46:15, 48:15, 51:14, 51:24, 88:12 allege [1] - 60:17 alleged [2] - 12:5, 15:3 allowed [6] - 28:11, 35:19, 73:7, 78:14, 79:18, 81:7 almost [1] - 82:25 ALSO [1] - 2:15 amenable [1] - 31:4 amended [16] - 20:18, 22:9, 31:13, 38:14, 43:16, 46:1, 46:9, 46:16, 47:9, 47:12, 47:15, 47:17, 47:22, 50:11, 51:24, 54:1 amount [3] - 18:21, 84:12, 85:4 Angela [1] - 79:17 animals [1] - 87:22 answer [94] - 7:22, 8:3, 8:17, 8:23, 9:2, 9:3, 9:16, 9:20, 10:25, 16:16, 20:12, 20:18, 22:9, 22:11, 24:24,

25:1, 25:6, 27:5, 29:23, 30:3, 31:6, 34:17, 35:15, 35:17, 36:25, 38:6, 40:18, 41:13, 41:19, 42:19, 44:15, 45:11, 45:14, 46:10, 47:10, 47:17, 47:21, 48:13, 49:23, 49:25, 50:1, 50:6, 51:12, 53:25, 58:21, 61:20, 61:21, 62:8, 62:17, 63:9, 64:1, 64:6, 65:22, 65:23, 66:2, 66:8, 66:12, 67:6, 67:17, 67:18, 68:1, 68:4, 68:10, 68:11, 68:12, 68:22, 68:23, 69:9, 71:12, 71:15, 71:23, 72:1, 72:11, 72:18, 73:9, 73:21, 74:2, 74:14, 76:8, 76:16, 77:8, 77:13, 78:10, 78:19, 79:16, 80:18, 81:5, 81:17, 81:20, 82:1, 82:4, 86:14, 90:25 answered [11] - 41:10, 44:20, 49:4, 50:8, 52:7, 53:13, 56:16, 61:24, 68:8, 68:14, 90:25 answering [12] - 4:15, 7:18, 35:13, 40:23, 52:10, 54:10, 63:1, 64:11, 66:2, 66:8, 76:15 answers [12] - 4:12, 6:16, 27:19, 27:21, 46:1, 55:3, 66:6, 85:5, 89:22, 90:10, 90:16, 90:20 anyway [1] - 83:25 apologize [6] - 6:10, 6:19, 9:11, 12:1, 23:18, 51:10 APPEARANCES [1] application [1] - 50:25 appointed [5] - 48:20, 49:13, 56:9, 56:20, 56:21 appointing [5] - 10:20, 10:24, 11:3, 12:14, appointment [1] - 48:25 appreciate [1] - 17:22

argumentative [1] -29:24 assign [4] - 28:15, 76:6, 76:12, 76:16 assigned [13] - 8:18, 27:3, 27:9, 48:9, 49:11, 73:10, 73:15, 74:21, 75:5, 75:13, 75:14, 76:14, 77:17 assignment [1] - 77:22 assistant [1] - 53:6 associated [1] - 7:4 Associates [1] - 2:4 assume [2] - 63:14, 73:7 assumed [1] - 37:18 **assuming** [1] - 73:6 **assumption** [1] - 63:17 assure [1] - 6:21 attach [1] - 93:9 attendance [5] - 2:2, 43:6, 44:4, 44:7, 45:1 attended [1] - 33:24 attention [1] - 9:12 attested [1] - 63:24 attorney [10] - 7:20, 25:2, 26:17, 27:13, 28:11, 28:12, 49:20, 49:21, 92:13, 92:14 attorney/client [1] -27:5 attorneys [4] - 26:12, 62:19, 62:20, 67:25 authority [6] - 10:21, 10:24, 11:3, 12:14, 13:13, 77:13 authorize [1] - 93:8 authorized [1] - 92:6 available [3] - 84:4, 84:22, 85:3 **AVENUE** [1] - 1:18 averments [2] - 46:1, 46:4 avoid [5] - 9:25, 78:15, 79:18, 80:4, 81:1 awards [2] - 61:22, 63:10 aware [7] - 21:20, 22:5, 27:18, 28:17, 61:9, 66:21, 73:24

В

background [3] - 23:11, 45:19, 45:20 bad [3] - 24:11, 34:2, 86:16 bargaining [6] - 87:3, 87:9, 88:7, 88:15, 88:24, 89:11 based [8] - 13:12, 26:11,

39:6, 63:17, 74:21, 80:8, 80:21, 88:15 basis [14] - 8:25, 21:12, 23:7, 23:19, 25:11, 25:14, 31:8, 31:23, 32:24, 39:8, 53:21, 56:5, 56:7, 61:2 begin [1] - 4:11 beginning [1] - 10:13 behalf [6] - 1:15, 2:8, 2:13, 25:25, 29:10, 49:23 behavior [1] - 23:22 behest [1] - 73:22 belief [4] - 46:3, 48:16, 63:22, 63:23 **believes** [2] - 8:2, 10:3 benefit [1] - 42:20 **BENITA** [2] - 1:5, 93:3 best [16] - 11:22, 17:2, 17:20, 50:8, 52:19, 53:2, 54:7, 61:6, 65:14, 65:17, 68:8, 69:11, 73:16, 74:1, 77:24, 82:7 between [3] - 18:18, 33:10, 87:17 Bill [5] - 25:19, 26:15, 28:4, 28:7, 28:12 blah [3] - 42:25 blah-blah-blah [1] -42:25 blaming [1] - 84:20 **BOARD** [1] - 1:7 board [46] - 25:21, 25:25, 26:2, 26:20, 27:9, 27:20, 31:9, 31:11, 31:16, 31:24, 32:11, 32:19, 32:20, 33:24, 35:6, 46:2, 46:9, 46:16, 48:20, 49:7, 64:25, 65:15, 66:19, 66:22, 67:6, 69:12, 70:1, 72:18, 73:23, 74:7, 74:21, 76:12, 76:13, 76:16, 77:2, 87:1, 87:8, 87:13, 87:18, 88:13, 88:18, 88:21, 88:22, 91:3, 91:7 Board [4] - 33:1, 33:3, 48:8, 49:10 board's [1] - 73:23 boards [1] - 35:20 Boca [1] - 2:6 bodies [1] - 50:23 **body** [1] - 31:9

bothered [1] - 12:10

Boulevard [1] - 2:10

bound [4] - 19:6, 19:7,

MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO

appreciated [1] - 51:20

arbitration [1] - 87:6

arguably [1] - 89:5

April [1] - 50:15

24:23, 89:10

Boys [1] - 33:17

break [11] - 34:11,
34:13, 36:9, 36:11,
56:22, 70:6, 70:7,
70:8, 75:23, 90:19

breaking [2] - 70:20,
75:25

broken [1] - 11:1

bully [1] - 57:13

Bush [2] - 7:10, 79:25

BY [2] - 3:3, 4:7

bye [1] - 85:19

C

cannot [2] - 8:6, 90:24 Cantalamessa [4] -2:17, 83:8, 83:18, 85:9 CANTALAMESSA [5] -83:10, 83:15, 83:24, 85:10, 85:17 capable [1] - 77:5 captioned [1] - 93:7 car [1] - 36:1 cards [3] - 78:25, 79:22, 81:21 care [1] - 87:23 Caryn [7] - 2:4, 2:4, 5:3, 9:15, 42:8, 67:8, 83:17 **CASE** [2] - 1:5, 93:3 case [4] - 6:22, 7:4, 88:9, 89:4 categorically [1] - 12:7 categories [1] - 5:22 category [3] - 9:10, 30:12, 85:24 caught [1] - 10:9 caused [2] - 23:23, 74:6 certain [5] - 7:8, 15:7, 18:21, 37:24, 53:3 certainty [3] - 17:7, 64:18, 71:14 certified [1] - 4:5 certify [2] - 92:7, 92:7 cgroedel@groedel [1] -2:7 cgroedel@groedellaw.com [1] - 2:7 Chagrin [1] - 2:10 change [2] - 68:11, 68:23 changed [2] - 15:9, 15:18 changes [1] - 93:7 **CHANGES** [1] - 93:23 Charles [9] - 52:16,

52:19, 53:5, 53:8,

54:3, 54:9, 54:10,

86:13. 86:23

check [7] - 23:11, 40:25, 41:5, 41:14, 45:19, 45:20, 79:7 checked [2] - 79:1, 79:6 **chief** [4] - 50:13, 51:1, 56:4, 56:6 Christina [3] - 43:14, 54:22, 54:23 circumstances [1] -26:7 Civil [2] - 4:4, 92:15 civil [1] - 26:14 claim [2] - 49:22, 87:21 clarify [2] - 35:3, 39:18 classified [4] - 11:17, 11:20, 18:23, 19:2 clean [1] - 23:25 clear [3] - 20:3, 44:24, 79:10 clearly [1] - 66:17 Cleveland [2] - 2:11, 92:19 client [5] - 29:18, 49:21, 67:10, 83:22, 89:20 client's [1] - 49:23 clock [5] - 18:4, 18:16, 44:10, 44:13, 44:18 **close** [3] - 38:5, 66:14, 66:15 closely [1] - 60:19 Co [1] - 2:4 Code [4] - 34:23, 35:5, 87:21, 88:3 code [5] - 16:14, 19:14, 19:18, 19:20, 87:10 collective [6] - 87:3, 87:9, 88:7, 88:15, 88:24, 89:11 coming [1] - 36:1 **commission** [6] - 11:3, 47:20, 61:15, 61:20, 61:24, 92:25 Commission's [1] -55:19 commissioner [14] -7:11, 9:15, 10:5, 10:8, 10:17, 14:12, 14:20, 33:25, 35:25, 61:5, 65:18, 73:22, 78:1, 78:12 Commissioner [9] - 8:2, 10:3, 47:7, 66:15, 71:25, 77:25, 83:7, 83:18, 85:8 commissioner's [2] -47:10, 76:13 Commissioners [2] -48:8, 49:10

commissioners [59] -7:13, 10:20, 10:22, 10:24, 11:7, 13:8, 14:1, 14:11, 14:15, 14:18, 16:20, 19:13, 19:17, 19:24, 20:6, 25:21, 25:25, 26:13, 26:20, 27:10, 28:13, 29:10, 31:25, 32:20, 34:9, 34:14, 34:19, 35:6, 35:9, 35:22, 46:2, 50:11, 60:21, 61:9, 63:8, 63:12, 64:17, 64:25, 65:16, 65:24, 66:23, 66:25, 67:20, 67:22, 69:12, 71:7, 74:5, 74:6, 74:11, 74:18, 74:19, 74:23, 76:4, 76:5, 76:14, 77:3, 77:4, 87:13, 87:18 committed [1] - 15:4 communication [3] -28:19, 29:17, 29:21 complain [2] - 70:21, 70:22 complaint [30] - 20:12, 20:19, 22:9, 30:21, 30:23, 31:13, 38:14, 38:23, 43:16, 46:1, 46:9, 46:16, 47:9, 47:12, 47:18, 47:22, 49:23, 50:11, 51:25, 52:10, 53:13, 53:23, 53:25, 54:1, 60:16, 60:17, 60:20, 60:23 complaints [2] - 7:4, 43:25 completely [3] - 12:13, 19:3, 89:9 component [2] - 19:11, 19:23 components [1] - 40:24 comprised [1] - 68:6 concerning [3] - 11:23, 29:2, 29:6 concerns [1] - 44:2 concise [1] - 28:21 conclude [1] - 25:23 **conclusion** [4] - 46:12, 49:17, 49:22, 50:5 conduct [2] - 12:12, 23:22 confer [1] - 8:21 **conference** [4] - 1:10, 16:7, 16:11, 88:11 conferencing [1] - 2:3 conflict [1] - 28:16 confused [1] - 32:15

conjunction [1] - 62:25 connected [1] - 46:24 connection [2] - 2:2, 33.5 considered [6] - 10:22, 10:23, 13:25, 14:11, 14:15, 40:15 considering [3] - 13:21, 14:19, 16:20 contact [2] - 58:9, 64:17 contained [3] - 6:12, 51:14, 63:10 contract [2] - 87:20, 92:15 contrary [3] - 87:2, 87:3, 87:8 controversy [1] - 24:1 conversation [4] -25:18, 26:3, 65:24, 76:24 conversations [4] -66:17, 66:20, 66:23, 74:17 convicted [3] - 72:10, 72:21, 86:14 conviction [4] - 61:4, 73:11, 76:18, 77:18 **convictions** [1] - 75:10 Cook [23] - 2:16, 11:17, 11:25, 12:1, 13:16, 13:22, 14:4, 22:1, 22:25, 37:8, 37:14, 39:2, 39:22, 40:25, 42:1, 42:3, 45:5, 54:4, 57:11, 59:24, 60:10, 66:16, 85:24 COOK [1] - 1:3 Cook's [3] - 36:2, 44:25, 64:12 copies [1] - 63:6 copy [1] - 20:12 correct [38] - 6:5, 6:6, 13:23, 13:24, 22:20, 24:16, 24:20, 31:15, 33:20, 33:23, 34:6, 34:7, 36:22, 39:19, 40:12, 41:6, 41:8, 47:10, 52:15, 54:17, 57:11, 59:3, 59:12, 64:22, 66:3, 67:1, 68:20, 76:8, 76:9, 77:19, 78:6, 78:13, 80:6, 81:8, 82:22, 82:23, 85:25 corrected [1] - 15:10 correction [1] - 93:10 correspondence [1] -58:5 CORSA [2] - 28:15, 28:20

confusing [1] - 57:16

COMMISSIONERS [1] -

counsel [17] - 1:15, 6:17, 22:2, 26:8, 26:14, 26:24, 27:3, 27:8, 28:15, 28:20, 29:18, 29:21, 62:23, 63:16, 69:13, 74:22, 92:13 counseling [4] - 42:4, 43:21, 44:1, 44:2 counselings [1] - 44:3 County [21] - 31:3, 31:21, 31:22, 32:1, 32:7, 32:10, 32:12, 32:14, 32:18, 32:19, 35:6, 42:21, 43:5, 48:8, 49:10, 51:4, 61:23, 82:9, 92:4 COUNTY [1] - 1:7 county [7] - 24:11, 32:9, 32:21, 44:9, 61:4, 74:9 County's [2] - 48:10, 50:14 county's [1] - 78:24 course [2] - 12:1, 90:16 court [3] - 52:11, 54:2, 92:15 COURT [2] - 1:1, 93:2 COVID [2] - 35:19, 35:24 crimes [1] - 86:14 criminal [1] - 76:2 cross [2] - 1:11, 4:3 CROSS [2] - 3:3, 4:6 cross-examination [2] -1:11, 4:3 CROSS-**EXAMINATION** [2] -3:3, 4:6 current [1] - 10:13 customer [1] - 17:2 cut [1] - 53:7 Cuyahoga [1] - 92:4

D

D) [1] - 92:15
damages [3] - 21:14,
22:1, 22:25
Danso [5] - 25:19,
26:15, 28:4, 28:7,
28:12
date [5] - 10:17, 58:11,
80:7, 92:12
Date [2] - 93:5, 93:25
dated [1] - 58:15
dates [5] - 83:2, 83:3,
85:6, 90:7, 91:4
days [7] - 52:3, 52:14,
58:10, 88:14, 88:17,
88:19, 89:2

34:8, 34:10, 34:15, 35:22 decisions [1] - 34:24 declining [1] - 30:4 defendant [7] - 41:21, 51:12, 51:22, 52:11, 52:13, 52:22, 56:18 **Defendant** [5] - 1:8, 2:13, 48:14, 62:2, 72:11 **defendants** [3] - 31:2, 42:17, 58:8 defense [4] - 22:15, 23:7, 23:19, 25:12 **Defense** [6] - 21:13, 23:5, 25:10, 25:15, 29:3, 29:6 defenses [5] - 6:13, 20:13, 20:16, 27:19, 40:4 defined [1] - 92:15 definitely [2] - 67:22, 74:17 definitively [1] - 50:19 defy [1] - 90:16 delays [1] - 84:19 demonstrated [1] - 71:8 denial [13] - 30:17, 31:6, 31:8, 31:14, 31:15, 32:24, 39:9, 46:18, 47:16, 54:11, 56:5, 56:7, 78:6 **Denial** [1] - 54:22 denials [1] - 30:18 denied [22] - 31:15, 32:23, 33:23, 39:6, 39:19, 39:20, 40:11, 40:22, 42:20, 52:11, 53:15, 56:2, 56:8, 56:13. 56:17. 57:1. 58:11, 60:15, 61:1, 77:8 denies [10] - 48:14, 51:12, 51:13, 51:23, 53:13, 53:14, 53:22, 54:11, 56:18 deny [14] - 49:15, 58:8, 61:3, 61:21, 62:2, 64:2, 64:5, 66:12, 66:22, 72:8, 72:12, 72:19, 73:14, 79:17 department [9] - 11:11, 11:16, 13:6, 13:7, 13:11, 18:24, 19:10, 32:12, 50:22 **Deponent** [1] - 93:4 deposed [2] - 4:5, 28:24

decided [6] - 12:18,

decision [5] - 19:12,

13:12, 34:1, 35:8, 77:2

Deposition [3] - 1:10, 93:5, 93:6 deposition [20] - 6:8, 8:15, 22:23, 29:2, 29:5, 38:1, 41:6, 41:14, 44:23, 45:24, 47:15, 55:5, 55:23, 57:7, 57:20, 61:11, 91:12, 92:8, 92:9, 92:12 **DEPOSITION** [1] - 93:1 depositions [4] - 24:7, 59:21, 84:16, 92:7 deputy [4] - 50:13, 51:1, 56:5, 56:6 description [1] - 75:12 determine [7] - 21:25, 22:7, 22:14, 22:22, 22:24, 38:13, 64:24 **DeVengencie** [2] - 7:10, 79:25 DeVengencie-Bush [2] - 7:10, 79:25 die [1] - 71:5 died [2] - 70:1, 71:9 difference [4] - 16:8, 18:18, 33:10, 37:24 different [12] - 18:23, 19:4, 29:19, 34:12, 47:24, 48:2, 48:23, 50:23, 57:14, 64:16, 79:9, 89:9 difficulties [2] - 46:21, 86:20 directing [1] - 48:9 direction [1] - 92:10 directly [1] - 7:16 director [15] - 11:24, 36:17, 45:8, 48:21, 50:15, 50:16, 59:3, 59:15, 59:16, 59:22, 63:14, 64:14, 75:9, 75:10, 76:3 disagree [3] - 50:2, 59:6, 59:9 disappear [1] - 18:20 discharge [4] - 78:15, 79:18. 80:4. 81:2 disciplinary [6] - 7:12, 10:21, 16:7, 16:10, 88:10, 88:19 discipline [33] - 10:23, 11:6, 11:7, 11:8, 11:24, 12:15, 12:18, 13:5, 13:6, 13:21, 14:1, 14:11, 14:15, 14:19, 15:6, 15:22, 15:25, 16:20, 17:6, 17:8, 17:11, 18:18,

19:1, 24:15, 24:19,

25:5, 42:5, 43:21, 44:1, 44:2, 81:15 disciplines [2] - 13:9, 44:3 discovery [1] - 22:23 discuss [2] - 65:19, 74:11 discussed [8] - 6:15, 7:7, 10:22, 24:6, 28:19, 33:16, 55:25, 59:1 discussing [1] - 74:22 **Discussion** [1] - 85:23 discussion [5] - 67:19, 67:20, 71:10, 71:11, 77:1 discussions [2] - 67:21, 67:24 disposed [1] - 89:4 dispute [1] - 9:25 **DISTRICT** [4] - 1:1, 1:1, 93:2, 93:2 **DIVISION** [2] - 1:2, 93:3 doctor's [2] - 35:25, 36:1 document [3] - 22:24, 34:24, 43:11 documented [1] - 45:2 documents [17] - 6:15, 6:18, 21:19, 21:22, 22:21, 25:23, 26:1, 29:1, 33:4, 35:5, 38:1, 38:20, 39:4, 40:2, 61:12, 62:17, 73:18 dog [4] - 12:2, 13:16, 13:22, 14:21 doings [1] - 23:24 dollars [1] - 90:7 done [13] - 22:13, 38:10, 62:7, 63:19, 66:25, 71:14, 73:22, 75:14, 84:21, 86:2, 89:24, 90:6. 90:22 door [2] - 10:10 down [11] - 34:11, 34:13, 67:12, 70:7, 70:8, 70:20, 75:23, 76:1, 90:19 **Drive** [1] - 2:5 due [4] - 23:9, 35:24, 46:20, 86:19 duly [2] - 4:4, 92:8 during [11] - 10:7, 10:11, 12:20, 13:1, 18:15, 33:24, 35:19, 57:7, 61:23, 85:25, 87:23 duties [9] - 37:18, 59:11, 64:16, 75:4, 75:5, 75:13, 75:17,

76:3, 87:24 **duty** [6] - 48:9, 48:23, 49:11, 49:12, 76:13, 77:23

Ε

e-mail [4] - 5:7, 20:15, 57:21, 58:2 e-mails [1] - 57:8 easier [1] - 41:11 **EASTERN** [2] - 1:2, 93:3 educated [1] - 28:24 education [8] - 39:2, 39:21, 40:12, 40:16, 40:20, 41:1, 41:15, 45:6 effect [1] - 18:5 effective [1] - 58:10 efficient [1] - 41:11 effort [3] - 21:15, 22:7, 30:2 efforts [5] - 21:18, 21:23, 22:1, 22:25, 62:17 eight [3] - 52:3, 52:14, 58:10 Eighth [2] - 23:5, 23:6 either [5] - 14:22, 21:18, 26:24, 35:25, 74:16 either/or [1] - 72:20 elected [1] - 51:8 electronic [1] - 47:11 embarrassment [2] -24:11, 24:12 employed [1] - 82:9 employee [32] - 7:2, 12:2, 12:3, 12:13, 13:10, 13:12, 13:16, 13:23, 14:10, 14:22, 14:23, 15:1, 15:22, 16:22, 16:25, 17:8, 18:7, 24:9, 64:3, 64:6, 76:13, 81:9, 82:3, 82:9, 82:16, 85:1, 87:6, 89:12, 92:13, 92:14 employees [34] - 6:16, 7:7. 7:8. 7:9. 7:16. 10:19, 10:23, 11:2, 11:5, 11:6, 11:15, 11:18, 13:20, 13:25, 14:5, 14:18, 14:24, 15:4, 15:13, 16:19, 17:10, 17:12, 18:23, 19:7, 57:4, 57:10,

57:13, 57:23, 63:3,

75:11, 82:7

Employment [2] -

64:11, 64:15, 64:18,

32:25, 33:2 employment [11] -21:16, 24:6, 34:3, 35:8, 42:24, 43:5, 50:22, 56:22, 61:23, 62:5, 85:25 employments [1] -21:17 enacted [2] - 35:19, 35:23 end [1] - 91:6 ending [1] - 48:14 entered [2] - 87:4, 93:7 entire [2] - 43:4, 93:6 entirely [1] - 29:19 entirety [1] - 40:24 entities [1] - 31:2 entitled [5] - 23:8, 23:14, 41:23, 41:25, 42:19 entity [9] - 31:17, 31:18, 31:19, 31:21, 32:6, 32:10 equivalency [2] - 40:14, 40:19 **ERNEST**[1] - 1:3 Ernest [2] - 2:16, 57:11 ERRATA [1] - 93:1 Errata [2] - 93:8, 93:9 especially [1] - 24:9 **Esq** [2] - 2:4, 2:9 estoppel [1] - 25:10 evaluations [3] - 85:24, 86:4, 86:6 evicted [1] - 72:5 exactly [5] - 41:12, 53:19, 58:5, 70:5, 87:12 **examination** [2] - 1:11, **EXAMINATION** [3] - 3:2, 3:3, 4:6 excellent [1] - 20:24 exchange [1] - 58:2 exchanges [1] - 57:22 **executive** [6] - 33:25, 34:25, 35:3, 65:20, 74:11, 76:24 exemplary [1] - 24:8 **EXHIBIT** [2] - 3:5, 3:6 Exhibit [10] - 3:7, 3:7, 4:25, 21:1, 21:4, 46:23, 46:24, 47:2, 55:18, 58:21 **exhibit** [2] - 5:9, 55:5 **Exhibits** [3] - 3:8, 55:1, 55:8 existed [1] - 18:12

60:10

expires [1] - 92:25

explain [5] - 8:24, 9:16, 9:17, 10:1, 90:12

explained [1] - 76:1

eyes [2] - 26:9, 81:10

F

Facebook [2] - 57:9, 57:21 fact [7] - 23:25, 27:8, 29:8, 29:14, 39:6, 62:7 facts [4] - 27:7, 29:14 factual [6] - 25:11, 25:14, 31:8, 31:23, 32:24, 61:2 failed [4] - 21:13, 41:21, 42:18, 58:8 failing [1] - 87:22 Fair [1] - 51:19 fair [1] - 66:18 faith [5] - 8:20, 21:15, 22:7, 30:2, 34:2 **Falls** [1] - 2:5 false [3] - 71:17, 72:4, 72:7 Family [1] - 16:21 family [2] - 14:25, 85:12 far [2] - 17:3, 38:3 fashion [2] - 12:14, 34:16 Federal [1] - 52:11 feed [1] - 87:22 feedback [1] - 86:16 few [1] - 85:21 fiduciaries [1] - 16:9 fiduciary [5] - 11:16, 14:2, 16:8, 18:24, 74:20 figure [1] - 67:5 file [26] - 18:22, 29:23, 30:8, 33:2, 44:6, 44:25, 62:18, 62:25, 63:9, 66:1, 79:21, 79:24, 80:2, 80:3, 80:5, 80:6, 80:10, 80:18, 80:19, 80:23, 80:25, 81:4, 81:12, 81:19, 82:3, 82:19 filed [12] - 20:19, 22:9, 22:11, 22:17, 22:19, 32:22, 32:25, 43:11, 49:20, 49:21, 53:23, files [11] - 6:15, 7:3,

62:5, 78:24, 78:25,

79:1, 79:5, 79:14,

80:21, 81:23

filing [1] - 47:11

financially [1] - 92:14 **fine** [2] - 54:20, 67:16 finish [5] - 4:14, 84:1, 84:2, 90:14 finished [1] - 81:24 finishing [1] - 84:24 fire [1] - 57:12 firm [1] - 92:15 **first** [6] - 4:4, 6:2, 14:8, 30:18, 69:18, 92:8 five [5] - 36:10, 36:12, 57:3, 84:15, 90:4 **five-minute** [1] - 36:10 floated [1] - 10:10 **FLOOR** [1] - 1:18 Florida [1] - 2:6 **follow** [4] - 19:5, 25:2, 44:19, 45:13 following [2] - 65:8, follows [3] - 2:3, 4:5, 19:4 forego [1] - 58:18 foregoing [1] - 16:10 form [3] - 24:14, 46:3, 48:16 formal [2] - 52:10, 59:8 **formally** [1] - 58:9 former [1] - 82:16 forth [1] - 92:9 forties [1] - 37:21 forward [2] - 6:19, 83:7 **forwarding** [1] - 47:6 foundation [3] - 8:3, 54:5, 54:12 **four** [4] - 64:15, 64:17, 83:19, 84:3 Frenchko [8] - 4:10, 5:7, 8:2, 10:3, 10:8, 46:13, 47:7, 93:25 FRENCHKO [5] - 1:11, 4:1, 4:6, 92:8, 93:4 **frequently** [1] - 67:9 **Friday** [2] - 84:7, 84:8 Friedberg [1] - 2:10 friends [1] - 66:16 front [2] - 20:21, 25:6 Fuda [3] - 66:13, 66:15, 78:1 full [6] - 4:8, 4:23, 40:11, 50:14, 50:16, 56:19 **full-time** [1] - 56:19 function [1] - 35:20 fundraiser [1] - 18:14

G

furtherance [1] - 24:13

games [1] - 68:13

experience [5] - 40:15,

40:19, 45:7, 59:24,

gathered [2] - 62:22, 63:2 generalities [1] - 28:12 generally [1] - 28:14 given [8] - 16:5, 20:4, 63:16, 66:10, 76:7, 80:3, 90:8, 92:11 glance [1] - 7:19 God [1] - 47:23 Godfrey's [1] - 60:17 Goldner [9] - 36:18, 36:23, 37:3, 37:16, 39:21, 41:1, 41:15, 59:21, 60:9 governing [1] - 31:9 government [13] - 31:3, 31:17, 31:22, 31:25, 32:1, 32:2, 32:3, 32:4, 32:5, 32:7, 32:8, 32:10, 32:13 great [1] - 55:21 greatest [1] - 51:5 grievance [1] - 87:5 Groedel [2] - 2:4, 2:4 GROEDEL [47] - 3:3, 4:7, 5:1, 5:6, 8:5, 8:11, 8:19, 9:4, 9:9, 9:17, 9:24, 16:15, 20:25, 22:12, 22:18, 29:13, 29:22, 30:1, 30:7, 36:10, 38:8, 42:10, 42:13, 43:10, 43:14, 45:12, 49:18, 54:23, 55:1, 58:24, 60:3, 62:15, 67:11, 70:6, 71:20, 75:22, 79:4, 82:24, 83:22, 84:10, 84:15, 85:19, 89:13, 90:1, 90:13, 91:5, 91:9 grounds [1] - 61:1 group [1] - 11:5 guess [3] - 28:12, 52:22 guessing [1] - 50:20 guilty [1] - 89:8 guys [1] - 83:15

Н

half [1] - 56:11 hand [1] - 92:19 handbook [3] - 16:9, 19:6, 25:4 handled [5] - 9:10, 11:11, 13:5, 13:6, 13:10 hands [2] - 23:20, 23:25 HATHAWAY [1] - 1:18 head [2] - 4:13, 19:10 heads [6] - 11:11, 11:16,

13:6, 13:7, 13:11, 18:24 hear [7] - 4:18, 39:12, 39:25, 54:17, 54:18, 69:14, 73:3 heard [2] - 4:16, 74:3 hearing [1] - 33:7 held [1] - 49:21 help [1] - 33:12 hereby [1] - 92:7 hereinafter [1] - 4:5 hereunto [1] - 92:19 high [1] - 17:12 hire [1] - 80:7 hired [2] - 50:14, 51:16 hit [1] - 24:3 hit-skip [1] - 24:3 hitting [1] - 24:2 hold [3] - 17:3, 42:15, 43:3 Hold [1] - 43:17 holding [1] - 51:19 honest [3] - 26:6, 34:17, 90:2 honestly [1] - 12:11 hot [1] - 12:10 hour [1] - 90:8 hours [2] - 84:15, 90:4 HR [11] - 6:16, 7:7, 11:24, 59:15, 59:16, 64:3, 64:5, 64:11, 64:14, 86:24, 86:25 **human** [9] - 62:4, 63:13, 65:7, 75:8, 75:9, 76:3, 79:20, 79:23

ı

identification [3] - 21:5,

47:3, 55:9

identified [1] - 55:22 identify [2] - 79:11, 79:12 imagine [1] - 14:10 impact [6] - 7:15, 7:16, 13:10, 13:12, 20:4, 20:7 impair [1] - 4:22 implementing [2] -44:10, 44:13 imposed [3] - 12:16, 15:6, 17:6 impression [1] - 53:1 IN [1] - 92:19 inaccurate [1] - 31:24 inappropriate [5] - 8:7, 9:6, 12:11, 18:8, 18:13 incident [3] - 23:23, 24:10. 91:7 include [1] - 33:19

including [2] - 40:11, 40:24 incorrect [1] - 13:19 **INDEX** [2] - 3:1, 3:5 indicated [2] - 20:16, indicates [1] - 80:25 indication [1] - 63:10 individual [1] - 2:2 individuals [1] - 14:13 **information** [25] - 7:2, 22:6, 26:16, 30:19, 46:10, 47:19, 47:20, 48:16, 48:18, 49:1, 49:14, 50:12, 51:7, 51:13, 51:23, 52:12, 52:23, 53:4, 53:14, 54:11, 61:16, 63:16, 63:22, 63:23, 74:1 informed [2] - 64:3, 64:19 infraction [1] - 88:25 **infractions** [1] - 15:3 initials [1] - 79:9 initiate [1] - 57:3 initiation [2] - 65:4, 66:9 innocent [1] - 89:8 inquiry [13] - 62:1, 62:3, 62:9, 64:1, 64:23, 67:5, 67:6, 67:9, 68:3, 68:7, 69:9, 72:12, 72:14 instead [1] - 75:25 instruct [2] - 8:22, 73:25 instructed [3] - 8:17, 9:3, 53:8 instructing [1] - 29:22 instruction [1] - 30:3 40:23 12:11

instrumental [2] - 40:5, insubordination [1] insufficiency [1] - 25:17 insufficient [6] - 30:19, 46:2, 46:16, 49:14, 50:17, 61:15 insurance [3] - 78:25, 79:22, 81:21 interested [1] - 92:14 interesting [1] - 82:5 interfere [1] - 8:14 interim [10] - 36:17, 36:22, 37:2, 37:9, 37:10, 37:15, 37:16, 59:2, 59:22, 60:8 internal [4] - 6:14, 6:17,

interruptions [1] - 84:19

interview [2] - 21:20,

investigate [7] - 73:10, 73:15, 75:6, 75:10, 76:7, 76:17, 77:17 investigation [3] - 76:1, 76:22, 77:23 investigations [3] - 73:22, 75:19, 75:21 involved [1] - 23:23 involves [1] - 7:13 issue [2] - 11:23, 29:19 issues [5] - 24:5, 44:4, 44:7, 45:1, 90:3 item [1] - 61:10 items [1] - 13:11 itself [1] - 60:16

J

Jackson [10] - 11:24, 13:16, 13:22, 15:25, 73:9, 73:14, 74:20, 76:6, 76:17, 77:17 Jackson's [1] - 12:5 **January** [6] - 10:13, 10:18, 10:19, 33:23, 58:15, 58:16 **Jim** [1] - 81:4 job [11] - 37:7, 37:11, 45:16, 50:24, 75:4, 75:5, 75:12, 75:17, 76:3, 87:23 Job [1] - 16:21 jobs [1] - 14:25 journal [4] - 6:24, 7:2, 48:19, 65:25 journalized [1] - 48:21 **Judge** [2] - 9:7, 10:1 **JUDGE** [2] - 1:5, 93:3 July [1] - 72:4

K

Kathleen [20] - 2:9, 5:1, 8:14, 9:19, 23:2, 27:15, 28:5, 28:7, 29:7, 29:14, 38:8, 48:3, 49:25, 71:23, 82:24, 83:3, 85:11, 85:14, 89:13, 91:5 keep [6] - 9:18, 51:4, 59:22, 89:17, 90:10 keeping [1] - 44:9 Kelli [6] - 1:12, 21:1, 91:10, 92:6, 92:23, 92:24 kellipage@ pagereportingservice .comB [1] - 1:20 kennel [1] - 14:21 kind [2] - 9:11, 11:1

MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO

6:18

22:5

kminahan@ meyersroman.com [1] - 2:12

knowing [1] - 74:7 knowledge [30] - 36:5, 46:3, 47:19, 48:15, 49:1, 50:12, 50:18, 51:13, 51:15, 52:19, 53:2, 54:7, 61:6, 61:8, 62:9, 62:12, 62:14, 62:16, 63:2, 63:18, 65:14, 65:18, 69:11, 73:16, 73:23, 74:1, 77:16, 77:22, 77:24, 85:25

known [7] - 6:21, 7:25, 26:21, 52:4, 52:5, 52:9 **knows** [1] - 49:7

L

lack [17] - 47:19, 48:15, 48:18, 49:1, 50:11, 50:18, 51:13, 51:15, 51:23, 52:12, 52:23, 53:14, 54:11, 71:5, 71:9, 86:4, 86:9 lady [1] - 44:21 **LAKEWOOD** [1] - 1:19 language [2] - 18:8, **last** [7] - 8:20, 28:18, 30:2, 50:25, 82:10, 83:19, 84:7 late [5] - 85:21, 89:15, 89:16, 90:4, 90:24 law [7] - 16:12, 31:4, 50:3, 74:8, 77:4, 87:2, 87:11 law.com [1] - 2:7 lawful [1] - 4:1 lawfully [2] - 87:15, 87:22 lawsuit [5] - 31:10, 32:22, 65:1, 66:10, 67:23 lawyers [3] - 67:9, 89:19, 90:24 leadership [3] - 61:22, 63:11, 86:25 leading [1] - 44:23 learn [1] - 91:7 least [4] - 8:3, 38:16, 59:23. 60:9 leave [8] - 20:1, 20:5, 20:8, 87:2, 87:12, 88:3, 88:23

leaving [2] - 17:2, 80:9

left [2] - 83:14, 84:3

led [1] - 44:13

legal [10] - 7:3, 26:14, 46:12, 49:17, 49:22, 50:4, 62:23, 63:16, 66:5, 74:22

legislation [3] - 34:24, 35:18, 35:23 less [4] - 39:2, 39:21,

1ess [4] - 39:2, 39:21, 59:24, 60:10 1esser [1] - 24:14

letter [7] - 15:19, 53:19, 58:15, 64:7, 65:7, 88:10, 88:11

letters [1] - 66:1 letting [1] - 38:10 level [10] - 12:3, 13:9, 14:5, 14:9, 14:10, 17:12, 89:12

Lewis [4] - 2:10, 78:14, 78:18, 79:12

Lewis's [1] - 78:22 **Lewises** [2] - 78:23, 79:5

Lewises' [2] - 79:1, 79:13

license [1] - 72:19 lieu [1] - 16:6 life [2] - 40:17

line [3] - 48:10, 83:8, 93:10 **list** [3] - 6:22, 60:2,

67:13 **listen** [2] - 8:10, 9:23

litigation [1] - 21:22 living [1] - 72:6

location [2] - 34:15, 34:19

locked [1] - 22:10 look [41] - 4:25, 20:18, 23:5, 25:10, 30:12, 30:20, 32:23, 33:9, 36:7, 37:25, 38:19, 39:4, 40:2, 45:4,

45:24, 47:16, 48:13, 50:10, 50:24, 51:22, 54:19, 55:25, 57:12

54:19, 55:25, 57:12, 57:18, 58:6, 60:13, 60:19, 60:24, 61:10,

63:4, 63:8, 63:25, 64:23, 69:6, 79:13,

79:21, 79:24, 80:2, 80:17, 82:19, 83:7

looked [9] - 5:4, 27:24, 54:19, 57:7, 57:20, 79:22, 70:7, 82:42

78:22, 79:7, 82:12, 82:21

looking [23] - 31:12, 33:14, 42:3, 42:6, 42:7, 42:17, 42:22, 43:2, 43:7, 43:10,

43:2, 43:7, 43:10, 43:12, 46:6, 46:7, 48:1, 51:9, 55:12, 58:4, 60:11, 65:24, 70:12

looks [1] - 83:8 lost [2] - 6:9, 87:8 louder [1] - 4:18 low [1] - 17:12

lower [5] - 12:3, 13:9, 14:5, 14:8, 89:11 LPA [1] - 2:4 lump [1] - 57:16

M

ma'am [31] - 8:10, 9:12, 9:21, 11:14, 13:17, 16:17, 20:21, 22:21, 26:1, 32:15, 32:17, 33:11, 38:20, 39:11, 40:18, 44:1, 48:6, 51:19, 56:22, 62:7, 67:17, 67:18, 68:1, 68:12, 70:17, 74:13, 75:16, 82:20, 86:6, 86:15

mail [4] - 5:7, 20:15, 57:21, 58:2 mails [1] - 57:8

majority [4] - 74:7, 87:1, 87:13, 88:21

man [3] - 15:14, 15:15, 15:20

managerial [2] - 59:24, 60:10

manner [1] - 17:1 manual [1] - 18:25 mark [2] - 20:25, 43:14

marked [3] - 21:4, 47:2, 55:8 **Massuci** [7] - 82:3, 82:8,

82:10, 82:11, 82:13, 82:15, 82:17 **Massucis** [1] - 82:20

Matt [8] - 78:14, 78:18, 78:22, 78:23, 79:1, 79:5, 79:12, 79:13

matter [7] - 7:12, 73:10, 75:6, 76:7, 76:17, 77:18, 93:7

matters [1] - 10:21 Mauro [1] - 2:17 mean [12] - 23:22, 26:8,

53:7, 53:25, 60:8, 63:3, 66:13, 67:24, 68:21, 74:4, 80:23,

meaning [1] - 32:13 means [1] - 92:10 meant [1] - 88:19 meantime [1] - 9:9 media [3] - 18:4, 33:16, 33:20

medication [1] - 36:4 medications [1] - 4:21 meet [4] - 8:21, 45:5, 45:15, 45:21

meet-and-confer [1] -8:21

meeting [10] - 33:24, 34:6, 34:9, 83:23, 84:5, 84:17, 85:20, 88:13, 88:17, 89:18 meetings [3] - 69:14, 69:21, 69:24

member [2] - 26:2, 27:9 members [1] - 34:5 memory [1] - 57:25 mentioned [3] - 16:21,

17:13, 65:15 message [1] - 57:21 messages [4] - 57:8, 57:9, 57:24

Meyers [1] - 2:10 **MICHELE** [5] - 1:10, 4:1, 4:6, 92:7, 93:4

Michele [2] - 4:10, 93:25 mid [2] - 14:9, 17:12 middle [2] - 15:15, 79:9 might [4] - 14:23, 17:18, 66:19, 85:21

Minahan [4] - 2:9, 28:5, 29:7, 29:8

MINAHAN [71] - 5:3,

7:24, 8:9, 8:16, 8:24, 9:8, 9:15, 9:22, 10:2, 16:3, 22:8, 22:16, 22:20, 29:12, 29:16, 29:25, 30:5, 35:11, 35:14, 36:12, 36:24,

37:4, 39:12, 39:16, 41:2, 41:18, 42:8, 42:11, 43:8, 43:13,

43:23, 45:9, 46:11,

47:5, 49:3, 49:16, 50:2, 51:2, 52:6, 54:5, 54:12, 55:4, 58:22, 59:4, 60:1, 60:5,

62:11, 63:20, 66:4, 67:2, 67:8, 70:3, 70:9, 71:18, 71:25, 73:19, 75:20, 76:10, 77:10, 77:20, 78:3, 78:7,

77:20, 76:3, 76:7, 79:2, 83:6, 83:17, 85:8, 85:16, 85:18, 86:17, 88:1, 89:23 **mine** [3] - 43:4, 84:2,

84:4 **minimum** [2] - 45:15,

45:22

minute [4] - 36:8, 36:10, 43:15, 43:17 minutes [7] - 36:12, 85:21, 89:16, 89:19, 89:25, 90:22, 90:23 misdemeanors [5] -72:9, 72:20, 73:11, 75:11, 77:19 misrepresented [1] -66:19 Miss [6] - 29:8, 36:23, 39:21, 41:1, 41:15, 60:9 miss [1] - 43:8 missing [2] - 6:20, 6:23 mistake [1] - 88:20 mitigate [3] - 21:13, 22:1, 22:25 mitigation [2] - 21:23 moment [1] - 85:21 Monday [4] - 1:13, 58:17, 64:8, 65:8 monetary [9] - 7:14, 7:15, 13:9, 13:12, 19:10, 19:22, 20:3, 20:7 months [2] - 22:10, 59:12 morning [1] - 84:23 most [3] - 14:21, 28:24, 28:25 mostly [1] - 83:3 motion [6] - 30:8, 69:25, 70:14, 70:15, 71:3, 71:5 move [3] - 16:15, 67:16, 70:25 moving [2] - 55:4, 83:16 **MR** [5] - 83:10, 83:15, 83:24, 85:10, 85:17 **MS** [118] - 3:3, 4:7, 5:1, 5:3. 5:6. 7:24. 8:5. 8:9, 8:11, 8:16, 8:19, 8:24, 9:4, 9:8, 9:9, 9:15, 9:17, 9:22, 9:24, 10:2, 16:3, 16:15, 20:25, 22:8, 22:12, 22:16, 22:18, 22:20, 29:12, 29:13, 29:16, 29:22, 29:25, 30:1, 30:5, 30:7, 35:11, 35:14, 36:10, 36:12, 36:24, 37:4, 38:8, 39:12, 39:16, 41:2, 41:18, 42:8, 42:10, 42:11, 42:13, 43:8, 43:10, 43:13, 43:14, 43:23, 45:9, 45:12,

46:11, 47:5, 49:3,

49:16, 49:18, 50:2,

51:2, 52:6, 54:5, 54:12, 54:23, 55:1, 55:4, 58:22, 58:24, 59:4, 60:1, 60:3, 60:5, 62:11, 62:15, 63:20, 66:4, 67:2, 67:8, 67:11, 70:3, 70:6, 70:9, 71:18, 71:20, 71:25, 73:19, 75:20, 75:22, 76:10, 77:10, 77:20, 78:3, 78:7, 79:2, 79:4, 82:24, 83:6, 83:17, 83:22, 84:10, 84:15, 85:8, 85:16, 85:18, 85:19, 86:17, 88:1, 89:13, 89:23, 90:1, 90:13, 91:5, 91:9 Mulberry [1] - 2:6 Munroe [1] - 2:5 must [2] - 13:7, 19:12

Ν

name [8] - 4:8, 12:8,

15:17, 69:18, 78:20, 82:10, 82:17, 93:8 named [2] - 66:1, 92:7 names [3] - 14:22, 15:13, 15:16 necessarily [2] - 16:13, need [3] - 43:3, 70:7, 83:23 needed [2] - 62:21, 66:24 never [9] - 25:16, 25:20, 27:7, 27:10, 29:15, 74:3, 78:11, 78:13 new [6] - 7:23, 13:19, 21:16, 47:5, 48:24, 55:5 newly [1] - 49:12 next [5] - 30:12, 57:6, 58:17, 64:8, 79:10 **NICOLE** [5] - 1:11, 4:1, 4:6, 92:7, 93:4 Nicole [2] - 4:10, 93:25 night [1] - 71:2 Ninth [1] - 25:10 **NO** [3] - 1:5, 93:3, 93:23 non [1] - 11:16 nonclassified [1] - 19:3 none [2] - 29:4, 82:21 nonexhaustive [2] -6:22, 7:6 nonunion [7] - 11:22, 11:23, 13:14, 14:8, 17:11, 18:19, 19:9

noon [2] - 84:5

normal [1] - 90:16 **NORTHERN** [2] - 1:1, Notary [3] - 1:12, 92:6, 92:24 note [1] - 81:18 noted [1] - 44:6 notes [3] - 7:1, 81:17, 85:2 nothing [9] - 16:9, 23:1, 45:2, 65:25, 71:19, 76:2, 80:25, 81:7, 92:9 notice [7] - 1:14, 45:25, 47:11, 47:15, 55:23, 61:11, 92:13 notified [4] - 26:21, 53:16, 54:3 notify [2] - 52:2, 52:13 notifying [1] - 58:15 number [5] - 17:18, 36:19, 42:17, 55:18, 73:12 **NUMBER** [1] - 3:6

Number [44] - 7:22, 9:11, 9:14, 32:23, 33:11, 33:14, 33:22, 36:7, 43:4, 43:7, 45:24, 51:12, 52:12, 55:11, 55:25, 56:13, 56:16, 58:6, 58:19, 60:3, 60:4, 60:5, 60:18, 60:24, 61:10, 61:20, 63:1, 63:25, 65:2, 67:18, 68:1, 69:6, 70:12, 70:13, 72:18, 80:11, 80:19, 81:4, 81:5, 82:4, 86:2, 86:3, 86:8, 90:25 numerous [2] - 61:22,

0

o'clock [1] - 89:17

63:10

oaths [1] - 92:7 object [6] - 7:25, 41:18, 70:23, 71:20, 71:22, 71:24 Objection [2] - 35:16, objection [43] - 8:5, 8:8, 8:10, 8:21, 9:5, 16:3, 29:12, 35:11, 35:12, 36:24, 37:4, 39:16, 41:2, 41:18, 43:23, 45:9, 49:3, 49:19, 49:24, 50:4, 51:2, 52:6, 54:5, 54:12, 59:4, 60:1, 62:11, 63:20, 66:4, 67:2,

70:3, 70:10, 71:18, 73:19, 75:20, 76:10, 77:10, 77:20, 78:3, 78:7, 88:1 9:18 62:18, 63:24, 65:20 20:20, 92:25 93:2 36:1, 36:2, 79:20, 83:25, 85:11, 92:19 2:11, 31:4, 34:23, 35:5, 87:21, 92:3, 92:6, 92:19, 92:24 11:23, 12:2, 14:21, 15:4, 15:7, 15:8, 15:10, 15:18, 17:24, 18:2, 18:3, 20:5, 20:6, 20:8, 21:20, 22:5, 26:3, 33:19, 34:5, 35:25, 38:3, 41:9, 42:14, 42:15, 43:3, 43:11, 43:17, 44:12, 45:13, 46:24, 47:5, 49:9, 52:8, 55:12, 57:10, 58:18, 58:25, 59:16, 64:5, 66:20, 67:21, 70:21, 70:22, 71:7, 76:12, 77:3, 77:4, 77:8, 78:18, 78:21, 79:7, 79:8, 79:10, 80:14, 80:22, 81:8, 81:25, 82:22

objections [2] - 8:6, obligated [1] - 30:7 obnoxious [1] - 72:1 obtain [1] - 62:17 obtained [1] - 62:21 obtaining [1] - 62:20 obviously [1] - 22:8 occur [1] - 61:7 occurred [4] - 40:5, occurs [1] - 71:11 October [3] - 20:19, **OF** [4] - 1:1, 1:7, 4:6, offense [1] - 12:5 offenses [1] - 12:5 offers [1] - 42:21 office [8] - 18:8, 26:11, offices [1] - 51:7 officially [1] - 65:16 officials [1] - 51:8 **OH** [1] - 1:19 **OHIO** [2] - 1:1, 93:2 Ohio [11] - 1:13, 2:5, Old [1] - 33:17 old [2] - 78:1, 78:11 **older** [1] - 57:4 one [63] - 6:3, 9:6, 11:9, One [1] - 85:21 ones [11] - 11:13, 11:20,

14:2, 15:1, 18:13, 18:24, 55:21, 61:14, 80:12, 83:14 open [2] - 10:10, 55:13 opened [2] - 21:8, 47:9 opening [1] - 47:8 opinion [2] - 27:12, 87:7 opportunity [2] - 16:5, 80:4 opposed [1] - 4:12 order [5] - 46:5, 62:22, 62:24, 74:9, 88:9 original [3] - 20:15, 38:23, 93:9 originally [3] - 27:2, 73:10, 73:14 otherwise [1] - 22:5 ourselves [1] - 31:20 outside [2] - 32:1, 89:2 own [4] - 23:24, 24:7, 37:11, 75:2

Ρ

p.m [2] - 1:13, 91:13 page [2] - 48:11, 93:10 Page [4] - 1:12, 92:6, 92:23, 92:24 **PAGE** [3] - 1:18, 3:2, 3:6 pages [1] - 55:13 paid [2] - 19:15, 41:25 paper [1] - 78:24 paperwork [2] - 7:3, 27:23 paragraph [27] - 30:20, 31:2, 31:12, 36:20, 37:2, 38:13, 39:14, 41:21, 42:3, 43:20, 45:4, 46:6, 46:8, 46:15, 47:14, 47:16, 47:17, 47:21, 48:2, 48:4, 48:14, 50:10, 51:14, 51:24, 52:1, 54:25, 55:22 Paragraph [2] - 46:7, 46:18 paragraphs [1] - 46:4 Parks [2] - 86:13, 86:23 part [17] - 8:4, 31:24, 32:4, 40:11, 50:15, 69:8, 70:22, 75:4, 75:7, 75:8, 75:11, 75:17, 76:8, 86:15, 87:20, 87:23 participants [1] - 2:2 particular [1] - 88:9 parties [2] - 92:12, 92:14 pass [1] - 45:18

passed [2] - 23:11,

45:19 Patty [3] - 36:18, 37:2, 37:16 pay [6] - 19:23, 20:8, 41:21, 41:22, 42:18 paying [1] - 9:12 **PEARSON** [2] - 1:5, 93:3 pending [1] - 43:9 people [1] - 28:24 per [1] - 90:8 perfected [1] - 27:12 performance [3] -85:24, 86:3, 86:6 **performing** [1] - 59:10 period [2] - 10:5, 10:12 permanent [3] - 39:11, 39:15. 59:16 permitted [3] - 81:1, 87:11, 89:3 person [8] - 17:4, 24:2, 24:25, 34:9, 38:15, 63:15, 88:23, 89:10 person's [1] - 82:19 personal [4] - 27:12, 62:9, 62:11, 63:23 personally [2] - 54:18, 63:4 personnel [6] - 18:21, 44:6, 44:25, 62:25, 63:9, 79:13 **phone** [3] - 53:16, 64:10, 65:9 photographs [1] - 18:3 photos [1] - 18:15 phrase [1] - 59:23 physical [1] - 35:7 physically [3] - 34:19, 34:20, 35:1 pick [1] - 84:22 picked [1] - 37:10 PIETEANGEL [1] -79:17 place [3] - 8:8, 65:8, 92:12 placed [2] - 19:25, 87:1 Plaintiff [5] - 1:4, 1:15, 2:8, 4:2, 64:3 plaintiff [20] - 21:13, 32:25, 37:20, 41:22, 42:18, 43:6, 43:21, 48:9, 52:2, 53:18, 56:4, 56:6, 56:18, 58:9, 61:3, 61:22, 64:19, 64:25, 66:16, 72:8 plaintiff's [5] - 34:2,

3:8, 21:4, 47:2, 55:8 playing [1] - 68:13 plea [1] - 89:7 point [2] - 85:12, 89:8 points [1] - 72:9 policies [1] - 7:5 policy [6] - 16:13, 18:25, 23:10, 24:15, 24:19, 44:18 political [3] - 17:24, 18:14, 32:8 portion [1] - 31:1 posing [1] - 70:19 position [6] - 7:23, 48:21, 50:13, 56:4, 56:6, 86:24 posses [1] - 50:21 possible [1] - 84:7 posting [1] - 18:15 posts [1] - 33:20 power [1] - 75:1 Powers [1] - 81:1 Powers' [1] - 80:18 pre [3] - 16:7, 16:10, 88:10 pre-disciplinary [2] -16:7, 16:10 precede [1] - 81:15 preclude [1] - 25:4 preference [1] - 83:21 preparation [8] - 27:22, 29:1, 29:5, 38:1, 38:17, 38:18, 41:5, 41:14 preparations [1] - 33:7 prepare [6] - 6:7, 6:11, 39:8, 56:10, 81:17, 83:23 prepared [8] - 5:23, 6:19, 7:18, 17:18, 20:17, 38:18, 84:6, 84:9 preparing [2] - 28:5, 40:5 prescribes [1] - 88:8

presence [2] - 35:7,

PRESENT [1] - 2:15

previous [3] - 7:3,

printed [1] - 20:23

privilege [1] - 27:6

privileged [2] - 27:7,

problem [1] - 85:15

Procedure [1] - 4:4

problems [1] - 44:14

50:22, 90:25

privy [1] - 76:14

present [4] - 34:9, 35:1,

35:20

35:22

29:15

procedure [2] - 18:25, 23:10 process [7] - 19:5, 25:18, 26:13, 26:18, 29:10, 79:19, 88:8 produced [1] - 21:19 production [1] - 22:24 progressive [6] - 19:1, 24:15, 24:18, 24:19, 25:4, 88:19 proof [1] - 62:6 prosecutor [1] - 26:15 prove [1] - 62:18 proven [1] - 89:7 provided [1] - 4:3 Public [3] - 1:12, 92:6, 92:24 **public** [1] - 76:25 pulled [4] - 18:11, 47:25, 78:20, 81:22 pulling [1] - 63:3 purpose [1] - 4:2 purposes [3] - 21:4, 47:2, 55:9 pursuant [5] - 1:14, 19:14, 19:17, 35:22, 92:13 push [1] - 84:17 put [5] - 67:12, 81:16, 87:12, 88:22, 88:23 putting [2] - 75:25, 88:21

Q

qualifications [3] - 45:7, 45:15, 45:22 question/answer [2] -90:17 questions [16] - 4:22, 5:22, 20:14, 20:23, 24:24, 25:1, 28:25, 38:7, 39:1, 41:9, 68:12, 70:21, 75:16, 90:9, 90:18, 90:21 quick [1] - 4:11 quickly [1] - 83:19 quite [2] - 24:10, 90:2

R

Rae [4] - 1:12, 92:6, 92:23, 92:24 rate [1] - 38:9 rather [1] - 25:5 Raton [1] - 2:6 RE [1] - 93:2 reacquaint [1] - 40:9 read [11] - 5:17, 27:17, 27:19, 44:21, 48:1,

72:19, 73:11, 77:18,

Plaintiff's [6] - 3:7, 3:7,

48:7, 60:22, 70:4, 45:10 research [1] - 6:17 Revised [3] - 34:23, 93:6, 93:7 **Relations** [2] - 32:25, researched [1] - 78:24 35:5, 87:21 reading [2] - 9:11, 9:14 Richard [11] - 11:24, residence [1] - 72:5 ready [1] - 83:4 relationship [2] - 66:14, 12:4, 13:15, 13:22, resign [6] - 12:25, 16:5, really [7] - 28:1, 28:21, 66:15 15:25, 73:9, 73:14, 78:14, 79:18, 80:4, 65:19, 66:21, 68:14, relative [2] - 92:13, 74:20, 76:6, 76:17, 86:16, 89:24 92:14 77:17 resignation [2] - 81:10, reason [3] - 66:10, relevant [1] - 90:20 rid [3] - 33:17, 57:10, 81:14 57:23 71:21, 86:4 remaining [2] - 48:15, resigned [1] - 12:20 reasonable [12] - 62:1, 51:14 resources [9] - 62:4, role [1] - 10:17 62:3, 62:8, 63:25, Roman [1] - 2:10 remember [34] - 4:12, 63:14, 65:7, 75:9, 64:23, 67:5, 67:9, 11:12, 12:6, 12:12, 76:3, 79:20, 79:23, Rule [1] - 92:15 68:3, 68:7, 69:9, 13:20, 14:22, 15:2, 79:24 Rules [1] - 4:3 72:12, 72:14 15:13, 15:16, 17:23, respect [4] - 10:19, rules [2] - 4:11, 19:20 reasons [4] - 44:12, 38:24, 41:4, 56:10, 11:5, 19:1, 47:21 Rush [1] - 81:19 66:5, 86:9, 93:8 56:12, 56:25, 57:2, respond [3] - 20:17, Rushes [1] - 81:22 58:1, 58:2, 58:3, **Rebecca** [3] - 7:9, 62:22, 62:24 79:25, 80:17 60:19, 60:21, 60:22, responded [1] - 38:23 S receive [3] - 21:7, 46:23, 68:16, 68:18, 68:21, responding [3] - 7:21, 68:25, 71:6, 71:9, Salamone [3] - 70:1, 55:14 17:1, 63:4 71:16, 72:16, 73:1, 70:14, 71:3 received [13] - 5:15, response [5] - 22:4, 73:4, 73:7 saved [1] - 43:18 5:19, 27:2, 28:8, 28:9, 33:5, 33:7, 34:17, remembers [1] - 8:12 47:8, 53:17, 53:18, **saw** [2] - 27:16, 81:12 57:16 remote [1] - 2:2 53:19, 55:11, 61:22, screen [1] - 6:9 responses [6] - 6:14, remotely [1] - 92:11 72:8 7:5, 22:23, 40:4, 40:6, **seal** [1] - 92:19 recent [1] - 14:21 renumbered [2] - 42:9, 55:19 second [7] - 6:3, 27:4, recently [2] - 18:7, 42:12 responsibilities [2] -33:24, 70:2, 71:5, repeat [4] - 10:25, 71:10, 71:11 60:23 37:8, 37:11 recess [1] - 36:15 39:13, 79:2, 80:13 Second [1] - 21:12 responsive [1] - 22:3 repeatable [1] - 13:18 recollection [4] - 11:22, section [5] - 47:14, rest [1] - 19:6 17:2, 17:20, 26:7 rephrase [2] - 4:17, restroom [2] - 36:9, 47:24, 48:6, 55:22, record [16] - 4:9, 8:8, 23:12 60:4 36:11 10:16, 43:6, 44:24, replaced [8] - 37:12, Section [2] - 45:24, result [4] - 24:7, 24:9, 46:20, 55:16, 69:2, 37:14, 39:7, 39:9, 45:25 72:9, 72:20 72:22, 73:2, 73:4, 59:2, 59:6, 59:7, 59:10 see [20] - 17:15, 18:11, resume [1] - 50:24 85:23, 86:19, 91:9, replacement [6] - 36:20, 30:23, 31:4, 31:6, retire [2] - 12:25, 16:5 92:11, 93:8 36:22, 37:2, 39:11, 34:3, 40:25, 43:17, retired [5] - 12:20, 56:4, recorded [2] - 69:21, 39:15, 60:8 46:17, 47:23, 50:25, 56:6, 81:9, 81:11 69:24 replacing [1] - 38:15 52:1, 58:5, 58:12, retirement [3] - 81:13, records [4] - 51:5, report [1] - 7:16 61:25, 68:3, 69:19, 81:14, 81:15 78:20, 78:22, 80:9 79:21, 82:15, 85:12 reported [1] - 61:4 return [1] - 12:25 reduced [1] - 92:9 **Reporter** [1] - 93:6 seem [1] - 28:23 returned [2] - 12:21, referencing [2] - 45:1, **REPORTING** [1] - 1:18 self [1] - 61:4 13:3 79:12 reporting [1] - 92:15 self-reported [1] - 61:4 review [12] - 6:18, 6:25, referring [2] - 23:14, **send** [6] - 5:1, 5:9, 21:1, Request [6] - 54:21, 25:23, 26:1, 26:6, 82:22 55:18, 63:1, 64:2, 21:2, 28:13, 43:15 29:1, 33:4, 38:25, refresh [1] - 57:25 69:9, 70:4 sending [3] - 54:23, 53:22, 81:23, 82:1, regarding [4] - 26:22, 55:1, 55:5 request [4] - 62:2, 72:2, 82:6 27:14, 48:18, 58:9 72:13, 93:7 reviewed [21] - 5:16, **senior** [1] - 57:13 regardless [5] - 14:7, requested [2] - 7:19, 5:19, 6:11, 6:12, 6:14, sense [1] - 35:2 60:7, 69:21, 69:24, 78:21 sent [14] - 5:4, 20:15, 6:15, 6:24, 22:13, 82:12 25:19, 26:11, 27:18, **Requests** [1] - 55:2 22:21, 27:16, 38:24, regularly [1] - 35:20 require [1] - 35:7 62:25, 69:14, 73:18, 27:20, 46:24, 48:3, rehired [2] - 56:18, 80:22, 80:23, 81:4, 54:21, 63:6, 64:8, required [3] - 19:15, 56:20 34:25, 44:11 81:9, 81:19, 81:21, 64:9, 65:7, 88:12 reinstatement [3] separate [1] - 31:19 requirement [2] - 35:21, 82:4 23:9, 23:15 62:12 reviewing [1] - 60:22 separation [1] - 80:7 relate [1] - 20:4 **SERB** [1] - 33:10 requirements [1] - 45:6 revised [7] - 16:14, related [2] - 6:13, 50:21 requires [1] - 34:24 19:14, 19:18, 19:20, series [1] - 57:21 relates [3] - 38:4, 40:15, 87:9, 87:25, 88:3

serve [1] - 12:23

MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO

reschedule [1] - 85:14

served [1] - 52:10 **SERVICE** [1] - 1:18 service [15] - 14:25, 25:16, 25:17, 25:22, 25:24, 26:4, 26:10, 26:17, 27:12, 28:8, 28:9, 29:9, 29:19, 29:20 Services [1] - 16:21 session [6] - 34:1, 34:25, 35:3, 65:20, 74:12, 76:25 set [4] - 6:2, 84:15, 92:9, 92:19 settlement [3] - 87:4, 87:17, 87:18 several [2] - 5:12, 57:23 severance [3] - 41:22, 42:1, 42:18 shaking [1] - 4:13 Shamrock's [1] - 81:4 **share** [2] - 51:6, 51:7 **shared** [1] - 57:9 sharing [1] - 18:4 SHEET [1] - 93:1 Sheet [2] - 93:8, 93:9 sheriff [4] - 50:13, 51:1, 56:5, 56:7 sheriff's [1] - 50:22 **short** [1] - 83:14 **show** [1] - 89:20 shown [2] - 42:13, 42:14 **shows** [1] - 48:20 sidebar [1] - 66:20 signed [1] - 93:8 similar [2] - 11:17, 14:4 similarly [1] - 19:4 simple [4] - 28:1, 34:18, 39:22, 44:19 simply [1] - 52:12 situation [6] - 11:12, 23:24, 51:6, 82:6, 89:9, 90:9 situations [1] - 17:23 six [5] - 83:23, 84:18, 85:20, 89:17 skateboard [1] - 24:3 skip [1] - 24:3 skipped [2] - 48:4, 79:10 skipping [1] - 23:6 Smith [3] - 7:9, 79:25, 80:17 social [4] - 18:4, 33:16, 33:19, 33:20 someone [12] - 17:3, 19:23, 20:4, 57:9, 57:22, 59:10, 66:19,

66:22, 87:12, 87:16,

88:20. 89:6 **sometimes** [1] - 73:5 somewhat [1] - 58:3 **sorry** [30] - 5:8, 6:2, 6:9, 9:13, 10:9, 10:10, 12:1, 16:4, 20:3, 20:20, 27:11, 27:25, 28:8, 28:9, 30:17, 43:19, 44:22, 46:7, 46:18, 53:7, 53:25, 56:11, 62:1, 65:13, 68:23, 69:6, 81:24, 83:2, 88:10, 89:13 sought [1] - 21:16 **sounds** [2] - 22:6, 68:22 SPBR [1] - 33:10 speaking [3] - 8:6, 9:5, 9:18 speaks [1] - 60:16 specific [3] - 6:16, 57:24, 67:7 specifically [8] - 11:1, 12:6, 12:22, 15:5, 15:16, 23:18, 38:24, 78:21 **specifics** [1] - 58:3 spoken [1] - 73:18 **Spriggel** [1] - 2:5 SS [1] - 92:3 staff [3] - 78:20, 78:21, 79:21 start [3] - 4:15, 28:22, 84:18 started [4] - 10:16, 44:10, 84:4, 88:20 State [6] - 1:13, 32:25, 33:2, 92:3, 92:6, 92:24 state [5] - 4:8, 35:19, 49:18, 49:24, 63:18 statement [7] - 14:16, 38:13, 38:21, 39:5, 39:18, 40:3, 50:3 states [1] - 64:2 **STATES** [2] - 1:1, 93:2 statutory [1] - 32:9 stay [1] - 24:25 stellar [2] - 24:8, 43:6 stenotypy [1] - 92:10 steps [26] - 21:25, 65:21, 65:23, 67:4, 67:14, 67:17, 68:1, 68:2, 68:6, 68:15,

68:24, 69:8, 71:12,

73:1, 73:5, 73:8,

Steve [1] - 52:16

80:11

72:17, 72:23, 72:24,

74:13, 74:15, 74:17,

78:17, 78:19, 79:16,

still [8] - 18:23, 19:24,

22:15, 31:14, 31:15, 50:4, 83:8, 85:11 stipulations [2] - 1:14, 92:13 **stop** [1] - 68:12 strategy [1] - 66:5 strike [2] - 16:15, 30:11 stuff [1] - 24:12 **subdivision** [3] - 32:8, 32:13, 32:17 subject [6] - 11:6, 11:7, 17:8, 17:11, 24:18, 42:4 subjects [1] - 20:11 submitted [2] - 21:22, 63:5 **subscribed** [1] - 92:11 sue [1] - 31:4 sued [2] - 26:2, 31:12 sufficient [2] - 46:10, 48:16 suggestion [1] - 41:11 **Suite** [1] - 2:10 **summarize** [1] - 80:15 sunshine [2] - 74:8, 77:4 supercede [1] - 19:20 superior [1] - 18:9 **supersede** [1] - 16:13 **supposed** [1] - 52:20 **surrounding** [2] - 24:1, 24:2 suspended [2] - 19:23, 72:19 suspension [5] - 12:19, 12:23, 13:1, 19:15 SW [1] - 2:6 sworn [2] - 4:4, 92:8 Т

technical [2] - 46:20, 86:19 **Ted** [2] - 80:18, 81:1 temporarily [2] - 38:15, 59:10 temporary [2] - 39:10, 39:15 ten [6] - 59:23, 60:9, 89:16, 89:24, 90:22, 90:23 Tenth [3] - 25:14, 29:2, terminate [9] - 34:2, 69:25, 70:14, 70:15, 71:3, 87:15, 87:22, 88:16, 89:3 terminated [20] - 15:12, 15:18, 15:21, 15:23, 16:1, 16:4, 17:4,

23:13, 37:8, 37:9, 52:3, 58:14, 67:23, 86:13, 86:22, 86:23, 88:5, 88:6, 89:6 terminating [1] - 89:6 termination [32] - 15:7, 15:8, 15:9, 15:10, 16:6, 23:16, 23:17, 25:5, 35:7, 36:2, 42:4, 43:22, 45:5, 45:16, 45:21, 52:2, 52:14, 54:4, 57:3, 58:10, 58:11, 64:4, 64:12, 64:13, 64:19, 65:1, 65:12, 65:15, 66:11, 71:8, 88:8 terms [2] - 18:19, 45:6 testify [3] - 5:23, 10:4, 92:8 testimony [2] - 80:1, 92:11 text [2] - 57:8, 57:21 **THE** [7] - 36:8, 55:6, 83:13, 83:21, 84:1, 84:12, 84:24 theirs [1] - 19:4 thereof [2] - 86:4, 86:9 they've [1] - 42:11 thinks [1] - 7:20 three [16] - 4:11, 13:14, 13:20, 14:13, 18:13, 28:18, 34:8, 34:14, 34:18, 64:15, 68:14, 74:10, 77:12, 82:20, 83:13, 83:18 Thursday [1] - 58:14 timely [1] - 17:1 today [7] - 5:20, 39:8, 40:6, 40:10, 83:11, 83:20, 84:11 today's [1] - 38:25 together [1] - 75:25 **Tom** [2] - 81:19, 81:22 tomorrow [2] - 84:23, 84:25 took [5] - 7:1, 37:7, 52:16, 65:8 **top** [3] - 42:14, 42:15, 89:3 **topic** [10] - 8:18, 9:16, 10:4, 45:10, 55:4, 55:6, 58:23, 60:2, 86:2, 86:3 **topics** [2] - 6:13, 83:18 track [1] - 44:9 transcribed [1] - 92:10 transcript [2] - 93:6, 93:9

transcripts [1] - 22:23

transferred [1] - 86:24

transit [1] - 70:1 tried [4] - 8:24, 68:22, 82:6, 89:21 trouble [1] - 28:25 true [6] - 39:5, 69:25, 71:17, 72:4, 72:25, 92:10 **TRUMBULL** [1] - 1:7 Trumbull [24] - 31:3, 31:21, 31:22, 32:1, 32:4, 32:7, 32:10, 32:12, 32:13, 32:17, 32:18, 32:19, 32:20, 35:6, 42:20, 43:5, 48:8, 48:10, 49:10, 50:14, 51:4, 61:23, 82:9 truth [5] - 46:3, 48:17, 92:8, 92:9 try [4] - 28:21, 33:12, 44:19, 83:20 trying [7] - 43:17, 45:13, 53:21, 67:5, 70:25, 75:22, 90:12 twice [2] - 88:23, 88:25 two [20] - 11:11, 14:24, 15:4, 17:14, 17:17, 17:23, 34:12, 36:8, 56:11, 66:24, 72:9, 73:11, 76:5, 77:3, 77:12, 77:18, 78:23, 79:4, 81:22, 81:25 two-minute [1] - 36:8

U

typewriting [1] - 92:10

type [1] - 19:25

ultimate [1] - 19:12 unable [3] - 62:2, 64:24, 80:22 unacceptable [1] -12:13 unclean [1] - 23:20 under [9] - 24:15, 24:19, 31:4, 52:25, 63:22, 68:4, 69:11, 92:10, 92:15 unilaterally [1] - 77:5 union [17] - 11:15, 11:17, 11:19, 11:20, 12:2, 13:14, 13:21, 14:5, 14:7, 17:11, 18:10, 18:16, 18:19, 18:20, 19:9, 87:5, 89:12 **unions** [1] - 19:5 **UNITED** [2] - 1:1, 93:2 unless [3] - 59:8, 76:13,

77:3

unpaid [6] - 12:19, 19:15, 20:5, 87:2, 87:12, 88:22 up [13] - 9:6, 24:1, 25:2, 37:10, 44:13, 47:9, 78:22, 79:21, 80:18, 82:12, 83:20, 84:22, 89:20 upper [1] - 14:9

V

utterly [1] - 8:7

vacancy [1] - 86:25 verbal [7] - 4:12, 17:25, 18:1, 18:6, 18:9, 18:10, 18:20 via [1] - 2:2 Video [1] - 1:10 video [1] - 2:2 vigilant [1] - 21:17 violate [1] - 87:11 violated [1] - 77:4 violation [1] - 74:8 virtual [1] - 35:20 **VOLUME** [1] - 1:6 vote [5] - 12:15, 19:17, 35:2, 77:12 voted [2] - 34:6, 36:2 votes [1] - 35:1 **vs** [1] - 1:5

W

wait [9] - 5:25, 6:2, 16:4, 27:4, 30:16, 45:18, 64:5, 89:19, 90:24 Wait [1] - 6:10 waited [1] - 81:24 waiting [3] - 27:2, 27:8, 28:14 waived [2] - 26:19 walked [1] - 51:5 wants [1] - 25:2 warden [2] - 13:16, 13:22 warned [1] - 24:14 warning [3] - 17:25, 18:1, 18:9 warnings [1] - 18:20 week [1] - 6:20 weeks [2] - 28:18, 56:11 weeks' [2] - 41:22, 42:18 welcome [2] - 10:6, 48:12 WhatsApp [1] - 57:8 whatsoever [1] - 45:1 WHEREOF [1] - 92:19

whoa [1] - 86:1

whole [3] - 40:17, 70:16, 92:9 wind [1] - 10:9 withdraw [2] - 8:21, 30:2 WITNESS [9] - 3:1, 36:8, 55:6, 83:13, 83:21, 84:1, 84:12, 84:24, 92:19 witness [5] - 8:16, 9:2, 92:7, 92:11, 92:11 witnessed [1] - 63:3 woman [3] - 15:14, 15:15, 59:20 word [4] - 5:17, 19:12, 68:13 workday [1] - 17:25 workplace [1] - 18:5 wrap [1] - 83:20 writing [2] - 58:9, 92:9 written [3] - 64:8, 65:5, 83:4 wrote [1] - 44:21

X

x223 [1] - 2:11

Υ

year [1] - 59:12 years [7] - 37:19, 38:16, 38:22, 42:24, 43:5, 59:23, 60:10 younger [3] - 37:19, 38:16, 38:22

Ζ

Zoom [4] - 1:10, 2:2, 6:9, 90:3

MICHELE NICOLE FRENCHKO